



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 16, 2015

Ms. Ana Vieira Ayala
Senior Attorney & Public Information Coordinator
Office of the General Counsel
The University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2015-19168A

Dear Ms. Ayala:

This office issued Open Records Letter No. 2015-19168 (2015) on September 15, 2015. We have examined this ruling and determined that an error was made in its issuance. When this office determines an error was made in the decision process under sections 552.301 and 552.306 of the Government Code, and that error resulted in an incorrect decision, we will correct the previously issued ruling. Consequently, this decision serves as the correct ruling and is a substitute for the decision issued on September 15, 2015. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.011 (providing that Office of Attorney General may issue decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code). This ruling was assigned ID# 587975 (OGC No. 162571).

The University of Texas System (the "system") received a request for information pertaining to the requestor and/or a named individual. You state you will release some information to

the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note that the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office has informed this office the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code, 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.¹ Consequently, state and local educational 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"). We note the requestor is a parent of the student to whom some of the submitted information pertains. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these education records to determine the applicability of FERPA, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted records, other than to note that parents have a right of access under FERPA to their own child's education records, and this right of access prevails over inconsistent provisions of state law. *See Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n v. City of Orange, Tex.*, 905 F. Supp. 381, 382 (E.D. Tex. 1995); 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A); 34 C.F.R. § 99.3; Open Records Decision No. 431 (1985) (information subject to right of access under FERPA may not be withheld pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.103). Determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education record. The DOE also has informed this office, however, that a right of access under FERPA to information about a child does not prevail over an educational institution's right to assert the attorney-client privilege. Therefore, we will consider the system's assertion of this privilege.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming 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 that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. 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. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990

¹A 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>.

S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a 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, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). 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.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit 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. *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 that 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).

The system states the submitted information consists of communications involving system attorneys and system employees and officials. The system states the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the system and these communications have remained confidential. As you acknowledge, some of the e-mail strings at issue contain communications with a non-privileged party, the requestor. You state, to the extent these communications exist separate and apart from the e-mail strings in which they appear, you will release these non-privileged communications to the requestor. Based on your representations and our review, we find the submitted information consists of privileged attorney-client communications that the system may withhold under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Cristian Rosas-Grillet', written in a cursive style.

Cristian Rosas-Grillet
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CRG/cbz

Ref: ID# 587975

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)