



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 12, 2015

Mr. Mike Leasor
Counsel for the Eagle Mountain-Saginaw Independent School District
Leasor Crass, P.C.
302 West Broad Street
Mansfield, Texas 76063

OR2015-09217

Dear Mr. Leasor:

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# 563503.

The Eagle Mountain-Saginaw Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for eleven categories of information from the attorney for a named former assistant principal (the "AP") for the district relating to the AP's "claim of retaliation and discrimination" against the district, a named principal for the district (the "principal"), and other district employees. The district also received a request from the principal for twenty categories of information pertaining to the principal and the claims made against her by the AP. You state the district will release some information. Further, you state the district does not possess some of the requested information.¹ You also state the district will redact certain information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy

¹The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983). Likewise, a governmental body is not required to create or obtain information that is not in its possession, so long as no other individual or entity holds that information on behalf of the governmental body that receives the request. *See Gov't Code* § 552.002(a); Open Records Decision Nos. 534 at 2-3 (1989), 518 at 3 (1989).

Act (“FERPA”), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.² You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code and privileged under Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. We have considered your submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

Initially, we note a portion of the submitted information is not responsive to the request from the attorney for the AP because it was created after the date of the attorney's request. The district need not release information to the attorney for the AP that is not responsive to his request.

Next, we note portions of the submitted information are 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; [and]

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1), (3). We have marked a completed report subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The district must release the completed report pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the

²The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the “DOE”) has informed this office that FERPA does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental 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 that FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. We have posted a copy of the letter from the DOE to this office on the Attorney General’s website: <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

³We assume the “representative sample” 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.

Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(1). Portions of the submitted information also consist of information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the expenditure of funds by a governmental body subject to section 552.022(a)(3). The district must release the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3), which we have marked, unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(3). We note the district does not raise section 552.108 for the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1). Although you raise sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code for all or portions of the information at issue, these sections are discretionary exceptions to disclosure and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive Gov't Code § 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 470 at 7 (1987) (deliberative process privilege under statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver). Thus, the district may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103, 552.107, or 552.111 of the Government Code. However, you claim a portion of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) is privileged under rule 503 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). Accordingly, we will address your claim of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence for the information at issue. Further, because sections 552.101, 552.117, and 552.137 make information confidential under the Act,⁴ we will address these exceptions for the information subject to section 552.022. We will also address your arguments against disclosure of the information not subject to section 552.022.

Rule 503(b)(1) of the Texas Rules of Evidence provides:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or the client's representative and the client's lawyer or the lawyer's representative;

(B) between the client's lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

⁴The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

(C) by the client, the client's representative, the client's lawyer, or the lawyer's representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer's representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;

(D) between the client's representatives or between the client and the client's representative; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is "confidential" if not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client or reasonably necessary to transmit the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under Rule 503, a governmental body must 1) show that the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; 2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and 3) show that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. See Open Records Decision No. 676 (2002). Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under Rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You assert a portion of the information that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code, which we have marked, should be withheld under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. You assert the information at issue consists of an attachment to a privileged e-mail between an attorney for the district and a district employee. You state the communication at issue was made in confidence for the purpose of the rendition of legal services to the district and the communication has remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the e-mail communication at issue. However, we find the attachment at issue is separately responsive to the request and it exists separate and apart from the otherwise privileged communication to which it is attached. Further, we find you have not demonstrated this attachment at issue, standing alone, is a privileged attorney-client

communication. Therefore, we find the district may not withhold the attachment at issue under section rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.

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 with “concrete evidence showing the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See id.* 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.⁵ *See* Open Records Decision No. 555

⁵In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

(1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). On the other hand, this office has determined that 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). Further, the fact a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You state, and provide documentation showing, at the same time the district received the first request and before the district received the second request, the attorney for the AP sent a demand letter and settlement offer to the district. You also state the information at issue relates to these claims made against the district. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we find the district reasonably anticipated litigation on the date these requests were received. Further, we find the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation. Therefore, we agree section 552.103 of the Government Code is applicable to the information at issue.

However, 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. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a). We note the opposing party to the anticipated litigation has seen or had access to some of the information at issue, which we have marked. Therefore, the district may not withhold this information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code. However, we agree the district may withhold the remaining information not subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103(a).⁶ We note the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 at 2 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. The elements of the privilege under section 552.107 are the same as those discussed for rule 503. 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* ORD 676 at 6-7. 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).

⁶As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

You state portions of the remaining information consist of communications between attorneys for the district and district employees. You also state these communications were made in confidence in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district and these communications have remained confidential. However, upon review, we find the remaining information you seek to withhold was communicated between non-privileged parties. Thus, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

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. Section 552.101 encompasses section 21.355 of the Education Code, which provides, “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential.” Educ. Code § 21.355(a). 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 or administrator. *See* Open Records Decision No. 643 at 3 (1996). We have determined an “administrator” for purposes of section 21.355 means a person who is required to, and does in fact, hold an administrator’s certificate or permit under chapter 21 of the Education Code and is performing the functions of an administrator at the time of the evaluation. *See id.* at 4. Additionally, the Third Court of Appeals has concluded a written reprimand constitutes an evaluation for purposes of section 21.355, as 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.).

You assert the remaining information is protected by section 21.355 of the Education Code. However, upon review, we find none of the remaining information constitutes an evaluation of an administrator for purposes of section 21.355. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of 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. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). This office has also found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of

income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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, 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 current or former employees 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 we have marked are not excluded by subsection (c), and we have no indication the owners have consented to release of their e-mail addresses. Accordingly, the district must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, the district may withhold under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code the responsive information not subject to section 552.022 and not seen by the opposing party to the litigation. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the

extent the current or former employees 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. The district must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information to the respective requestors.

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,



Lee Seidlits
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CLS/som

Ref: ID# 563503

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)