



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 3, 2014

Mr. Robert Vina
Counsel for the Rio Hondo Independent School District
Walsh, Anderson, Gallegos, Green and Treviño, P.C.
105 East 3rd Street
Weslaco, Texas 78596

OR2014-19856

Dear Mr. Vina:

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# 542403.

The Rio Hondo Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for communications and police reports regarding two named district employees and all e-mails from the accounts of district trustees and the superintendent during a specified time period. You state the district is withholding student-identifying information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.¹ You state the district has released some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, 552.111, and 552.152 of the

¹The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office FERPA does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental or student consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act. The DOE has determined FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

Government Code and privileged under rules 503 and 508 of the Texas Rule of Evidence.² We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant request for information because it was created after the district received the request for information. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the district is not required to release such information in response to this request. As we are able to make this determination, we do not address your arguments under section 552.107 of the Government Code and Texas Rule of Evidence 503 for the information at issue, which you have labeled AG 010 through AG 011.

Next, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information includes a completed investigation that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The district must release the completed investigation pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold the information subject to 552.022(a)(1) under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, section 552.111 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver).* Therefore, the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1), which you have labeled AG 001 through AG 007, may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, as information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) may be withheld under section 552.108 of the Government Code, we will consider your argument under section 552.108 for the information at issue. Further, as section 552.101 of the Government Code applies to confidential information, and as sections 552.102 and 552.152 make information confidential under the Act, we will consider your arguments under these

²Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Texas Rules of Evidence 503 and 508, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).*

exceptions for the information at issue. You also seek to withhold the information at issue under rule 508 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. The Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are “other law” within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). We will therefore consider your argument under rule 508 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. We will also consider your arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) 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 satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. This office has found a compilation of an individual’s criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. United States Dep’t of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual’s privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one’s criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen’s criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public.

The present request, in part, seeks all police reports pertaining to two named individuals. This aspect of the request requires the district to compile the named individuals’ criminal histories and implicates each named individual’s right to privacy. Therefore, to the extent the district maintains law enforcement records listing either of the named individuals as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the district must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.³

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by other statutes. Section 21.355 of the Education Code provides, in relevant part, “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential.” Educ. Code § 21.355(a). The Third Court of Appeals has concluded a written reprimand constitutes an evaluation for purposes of section 21.355 because “it reflects the principal’s judgment regarding [a teacher’s] actions, gives corrective direction, and provides for further review.” *Abbott v. North East Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 212 S.W.3d 364 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.). This office has interpreted section 21.355 to apply to any document that evaluates, as that term is commonly understood, the performance of a teacher. *See Open Records Decision*

³As our ruling is dispositive for any such information, we need not address your remaining arguments against its disclosure.

No. 643 (1996). In Open Records Decision No. 643, we determined for purposes of section 21.355, the word “teacher” means a person who is required to and does in fact hold a teaching certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code and who is in the process of teaching, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *See id.* at 4.

You contend the responsive information consists of confidential evaluations of certified teachers by the district. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any of the information at issue consists of documents evaluating the performance of a teacher for purposes of section 21.355 of the Education Code. Accordingly, none of the responsive information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

You argue the remaining information is protected under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. However, this office has concluded the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employees and their conduct in the workplace. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 470 at 4 (job performance does not generally constitute public employee’s private affairs), 444 at 3 (1986) (public has obvious interest in information concerning qualifications and performance of government employees), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee’s job was performed cannot be said to be of minimal public interest). Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated how any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional 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. 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 scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; 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)). After review of the remaining information at issue, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any 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 of the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 on the basis of constitutional privacy.

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. Having carefully reviewed the information at issue, 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 remaining information on that basis.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in relevant part as follows:

(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). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show section 552.103(a) is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was 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. *See 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). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551.

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, or when an individual threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 346 (1982), 288 (1981).

You claim some of the remaining responsive information, which you have labeled AG 008 through AG 009, is protected by section 552.103 of the Government Code because it relates to litigation anticipated by the district. You state, and provide documentation showing, the district received correspondence from an attorney for a district employee whose employment with the district was terminated. We note the district received the correspondence at issue after it received the instant request for information. You have not provided this office with evidence any individual 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); Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Upon review, therefore, we find you have not established litigation was reasonably anticipated on the date the district received the request for information. Therefore, the district may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

You claim some of the remaining information, which you have labeled AG 001 through AG 002 and AG 006 through AG 007, is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. Section 552.108(a)(2) excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(2). By its terms, section 552.108 applies only to a law enforcement agency or a prosecutor. A school district is not a law enforcement agency. However, this office has concluded section 552.108 may be invoked by any proper custodian of information that relates to the underlying incident. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 474 (1987), 372 (1983). Where a non-law enforcement agency has custody of information related to a concluded criminal 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 is related to a criminal case that has reached a conclusion other than a conviction or a deferred adjudication and a representation from a law enforcement entity that it wishes to have the information withheld. In this instance, you do not state, and have not otherwise demonstrated, the district's police department, which is the investigative agency with the law enforcement interest, seeks to withhold the information at issue. Accordingly, the district has failed to demonstrate section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code is applicable to the information at issue, and the district may not withhold any portion of the information at issue on that basis.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, writ ref’d n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body’s policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body’s policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); *see* ORD 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

You argue the remaining information consists of communications of district employees and members of the district’s board of trustees regarding confidential matters that were not intended for release to the general public. Upon review, however, we find the information

at issue relates to the employment of certain individuals and does not relate to administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body's policy mission. Thus, we find you have failed to show how the information at issue consists of advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the district. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.⁴ Section 552.117(a)(1) 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, except as provided by section 552.024(a-1). *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.117(a)(1), .024. Section 552.024(a-1) of the Government Code provides, "A school district may not require an employee or former employee of the district to choose whether to allow public access to the employee's or former employee's social security number." *Id.* § 552.024(a-1). Thus, the district may only withhold under section 552.117 the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of the district who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. 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 only be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee 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. 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 information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1).

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 addresses at issue are not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the district must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

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

In summary, to the extent the district maintains law enforcement records listing the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the district must withhold such information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the district employees whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The district must release the remaining responsive 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, 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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 542403

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)