



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 23, 2013

Ms. Melody K. Smith
Counsel for the Cedar Hill Independent School District
Strasburger & Price, L.L.P.
901 Main Street, Suite 4400
Dallas, Texas 75202

OR2013-14821

Dear Ms. Smith:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 497457.

The Cedar Hill Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for (1) a list of all employees within the district whose names have been submitted to the Texas Education Agency for committing physical or sexual abuse against students, or being involved in an improper relationship, from January 2005 to July 2013; (2) documents related to specific investigations of five named current or former district employees; and (3) all information distributed to the public related to improper relationships between district employees and students. You state the district has released some information with redactions in accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232(g) of title 20 of the United States Code,¹ and information subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code as permitted by section 552.024(c) of the

¹The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office that FERPA does not permit a state educational agency or institution to disclose to this office, without parental or an adult student's consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act. See 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining "personally identifiable information"). The DOE has determined that FERPA determinations must be made by the educational institution from which the education records were obtained. A copy of the DOE's letter to this office may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

Government Code.² You claim portions of the remaining requested information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, 552.108, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the requestor seeks information created from January 2005 through July 2013, although the request was received by the district on June 5, 2013. It is implicit in several provisions of the Act that the Act applies only to information already in existence. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.002, .021, .227, .351. The Act does not require a governmental body to prepare new information in response to a request. *See* Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 572 at 1 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 2-3 (1986), 87 (1975). Consequently, a governmental body is not required to comply with a standing request to supply information prepared in the future. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-48 at 2 (1983); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 476 at 1 (1987), 465 at 1 (1987). Thus, the only information encompassed by the present request consists of information the district maintained or had a right of access to as of the date that it received the request.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *See In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, lawyer representatives, and a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Thus, a

²Section 552.117 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. Gov't Code § 552.117(a). Section 552.024 of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to withhold information subject to section 552.117 without requesting a decision from this office if the current or former employee or official chooses not to allow public access to the information. *Id.* § 552.024(c)(2).

governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, *id.*, meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *See Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You assert portions of the submitted information consist of communications involving attorneys representing the district and district officials in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You also state these communications were not intended to be, and have not been, disclosed to parties other than those encompassed by the attorney-client privilege. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information we have marked. Accordingly, the district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.³ However, we find the remaining information you have marked does not consist of communications between privileged parties made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.107(1).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes such as section 261.201 of the Family Code.⁴ Section 261.201 provides in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act] and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent

³Because our ruling is dispositive as to this information, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of the information at issue.

⁴The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

- (1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and
- (2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). We note the district is not an agency authorized to conduct an investigation under chapter 261. *See id.* § 261.103 (listing agencies that may conduct child abuse investigations). However, portions of the submitted information, which we have marked, pertain to an investigation by the district's police department of alleged or suspected child abuse that was subsequently referred to the Dallas County Sheriff's Department for further investigation. These agencies are authorized to conduct investigations under chapter 261. Upon review, we find the information at issue was used or developed in an investigation under chapter 261 of the Family Code, so as to fall within the scope of section 261.201(a). *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining "child" for purposes of section 261.201 as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes), 261.001(1) (defining "abuse" for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). As you do not indicate that the investigating agencies have adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information, we assume that no such rule exists. We therefore conclude that the information we have marked is confidential under section 261.201(a). Accordingly, the information we have marked must be withheld in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.⁵

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]" Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). By its terms, section 552.108 applies only to a law enforcement agency or a prosecutor. We note the district is not a law enforcement agency. This office has concluded, however, that where an incident involving alleged criminal conduct is still under active investigation or prosecution, section 552.108 may be invoked by any proper custodian of information that

⁵Because our ruling is dispositive as to this information, we do not address your arguments against its disclosure.

relates to the incident. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 474 (1987), 372 (1983). Where a non-law enforcement agency is in the custody of information relating to the pending case of a law enforcement agency, the custodian of the records may withhold the information if it provides this office with a demonstration that the information relates to the pending case and a representation from the law enforcement entity that it wishes to withhold the information.

You claim an e-mail within the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. You state this e-mail pertains to an ongoing criminal investigation involving the Cedar Hill Police Department (the "police department"). You inform our office a lieutenant with the police department has asserted that release of this e-mail would interfere with the ongoing investigation. Based on this representation and our review, we conclude that release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, the district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the police department.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be established. *Id.* at 681-82.

In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of the common-law privacy doctrine to files of an investigation of allegations of sexual harassment in an employment context. The investigation files in *Ellen* contained individual witness statements, an affidavit by the individual accused of the misconduct responding to the allegations, and conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. *Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating that the public's interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* In concluding, the *Ellen* court held that "the public did not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the documents that have been ordered released." *Id.*

Thus, if there is an adequate summary of an investigation of alleged sexual harassment, the investigation summary must be released under *Ellen*, along with the statement of the accused, but the identities of the victims and witnesses of the alleged sexual harassment must be redacted, and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 393 (1983), 339 (1982). If no adequate summary of the investigation exists, then all of the information relating to the investigation ordinarily must be released, with the

exception of information that would identify the victims and witnesses. We note that because common-law privacy does not protect information about a public employee's alleged misconduct on the job or complaints made about a public employee's job performance, the identity of the individual accused of sexual harassment is not protected from public disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 438 (1986), 405 (1983), 230 (1979), 219 (1978). We further note supervisors are generally not witnesses for purposes of *Ellen*, except where their statements appear in a non-supervisory context.

You state a portion of the submitted information is related to a sexual harassment investigation. In this instance, we find the submitted information does not include an adequate summary. Therefore, the district must generally release the information pertaining to the investigation. However, this information contains the identities of the alleged sexual harassment victim and witnesses. Therefore, the district must withhold the identifying information of the alleged victim and witnesses, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. *See* 840 S.W.2d at 525. However, we find the district has not demonstrated how any portion of the remaining information identifies a victim or witness of sexual harassment. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*.

You claim portions of the remaining information are confidential pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. Common-law privacy is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. The types of information considered intimate or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing or not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the district may not withhold this information on the basis of section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the constitutional right to privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy," which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). You assert portions of the remaining information are excepted from disclosure pursuant to the constitutional right to privacy. Upon review, we find that no portion of the remaining

information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of constitutional privacy.

You also assert portions of the remaining information are excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a). We understand you to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which is discussed above. See *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert's* interpretation of section 552.102(a), and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. See *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The Supreme Court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. See *id.* at 348. Upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the district may not withhold any of the submitted information on this basis.


Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. See Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. We note portions of the remaining information contain information relating to district employees that is subject to section 552.117(a)(1). Therefore, to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the individuals at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the district may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1).

In summary, the district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we have marked in its entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. The district may withhold the e-mail correspondence we have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. To the extent the individuals whose information we have marked timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/dls

Ref: ID# 497457

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)