



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 23, 2014

Ms. Melody Chappell  
Counsel for Beaumont Independent School District  
Wells, Peyton, Greenberg, & Hunt, L.L.P.  
P.O. Box 3708  
Beaumont, Texas 77704-3708

OR2014-10747

Dear Ms. Chappell:

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# 526687.

The Beaumont Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for contents of the in-boxes, sent folders, draft folders, and trash folders from six named individuals' district e-mail accounts. You state the district will release some of the requested information. You claim a portion of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. You additionally claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative samples of information.<sup>1</sup>

You contend the information contained in Exhibit B-6 is not subject to the Act. The Act is applicable only to "public information." See Gov't Code §§ 552.002, .021. Section 552.002(a) defines "public information" as information that is written, produced,

---

<sup>1</sup>We assume the "representative samples" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. See Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

- (1) by a governmental body;
- (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:
  - (A) owns the information;
  - (B) has a right of access to the information; or
  - (C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or
- (3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

*Id.* § 552.002(a). Thus, virtually all the information in a governmental body's physical possession constitutes public information and is subject to the Act. *See id.* § 552.002(a)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988). The Act also encompasses information a governmental body does not physically possess, if the information is collected, assembled, or maintained for the governmental body and the governmental body owns the information or has a right of access to it. Gov't Code § 552.002(a)(2); *see* Open Records Decision No. 462 at 4 (1987). You inform us the information in Exhibit B-6 is of a purely personal nature and unrelated to the business of the district. Based on your representations and our review, we agree the information in Exhibit B-6 is not subject to the Act and does not need to be released in response to the present request for information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 635 at 4 (1995) (section 552.002 not applicable to personal information unrelated to official business and created or maintained by state employee involving *de minimis* use of state resources).

Next, you state you have redacted some information in Exhibit B-3 pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code. The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office has informed this office FERPA does not permit state and local educational authorities 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.<sup>2</sup> Consequently, state and local educational

---

<sup>2</sup>A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website at <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

authorities that receive a request for education records from a member of the public under the Act must not submit education records to this office in unredacted form, that is, in a form in which “personally identifiable information” is disclosed. *See* 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining “personally identifiable information”). You have submitted redacted education records in Exhibit B-3 for our review. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of this information. Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of such records. We will, however, consider the applicability of any claimed exceptions to the information at issue.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in part, the following:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person’s office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov’t Code § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref’d n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a).

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body’s receipt of a letter containing a specific

threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). On the other hand, this office has determined if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982).

You inform us, and provide documentation showing, that before the district received the request for information, the district received a demand letter from an attorney representing an individual claiming damages related to breach of contract by the district, with a threat to pursue legal action against the district if it did not respond to the demand. You state, and we agree, the information in Exhibit B-1 is related to anticipated litigation. Based on your representations and our review, we determine the district reasonably anticipated litigation to which the information in Exhibit B-1 relates when the district received the request. Accordingly, we conclude section 552.103 of the Government Code is applicable to the information in Exhibit B-1, and the district may withhold Exhibit B-1 under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

You also claim Exhibit B-2 is protected by section 552.103. You inform us a lawsuit styled *Melinda Harper v. Beaumont Independent School District*, Cause No. D-0195558 was filed in the 136th Judicial District Court of Jefferson County on April 2, 2014. We note the present request for information was received by the district on April 1, 2014. Although you state the litigation at issue was anticipated at the time the district received the present request, you have not provided this office with evidence the plaintiff had taken any objective steps toward filing a lawsuit prior to the date the district received the request for information. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e); ORD 331. Additionally, you provide no explanation, and the information at issue does not reveal, how Exhibit B-2 is related to the litigation at issue. Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.103 to Exhibit B-2, and it may not be withheld on that basis.

We note once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

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. *See* 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 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 claim the information in Exhibit B-5 is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of communications involving district employees and attorneys for the district. You state the communications were made in confidence for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district and that these communications have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information in Exhibit B-5. Thus, the district may generally withhold the information in Exhibit B-5 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, some of these otherwise privileged e-mail strings include e-mails sent to or received from non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if these e-mails are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the district separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the district may not withhold these non-privileged communications under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. In that instance, the non-privileged e-mails must be released.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not within the scope of section 552.137(c). Accordingly, the district must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked in Exhibit B-4 under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their release.

In summary, the information in Exhibit B-6 is not subject to the Act and does not need to be released in response to the present request for information. The district may withhold the information in Exhibit B-1 under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The district may generally withhold the information in Exhibit B-5 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, if the non-privileged e-mails, which we have marked, are maintained by the district separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the district may not withhold these non-privileged communications under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked in Exhibit B-4 under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their release. The district must release the remaining information.

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](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,



Megan G. Holloway  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MGH/akg

Ref: ID# 526687

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)