



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 23, 2015

Mr. Justin Graham  
General Counsel  
Garland Independent School District  
P.O. Box 469026  
Garland, Texas 75046-4923

OR2015-24550

Dear Mr. Graham:

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# 588019.

The Garland Independent School District (the "district") received a request for information pertaining to the requestor's child. You state you will release some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Texas Rule of Evidence 503, 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). Additionally, although you raise section 552.022 of the Government Code, we note section 552.022 is not an exception to disclosure. Rather, section 552.022 enumerates categories of information that are not excepted from disclosure unless they are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022. Further, although you raise Texas Rule of Evidence 503, we note the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege in this instance is section 552.107 of the Government Code. *See* ORD 676 at 1-2. Lastly, we note although you raise the attorney work product privilege encompassed by Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, you provide no arguments explaining how this privilege is applicable. Therefore, we assume you no longer assert this privilege. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

Initially, you state you will redact information 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 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 unredacted education records for our review. We note the requestor is a parent of the student to whom 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. See 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A); 34 C.F.R. § 99.3. Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. The DOE also has informed our office, however, a parent’s right of access under FERPA to information about the parent’s child does not prevail over an educational institution’s right to assert the attorney-client privilege. Therefore, we will address your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under section 552.107 of the Government Code for the submitted information.

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. 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 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

---

<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>.

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 district states the submitted information consists of or documents communications involving attorneys for the district and district employees and officials. The district states the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district and these communications have remained confidential. Upon review, we find the district has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the submitted information. Therefore, the district may generally withhold the submitted information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, we note some of these e-mail strings include e-mails and an attachment received from or sent to a non-privileged party. Furthermore, if these e-mails and attachment are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if the district maintains these non-privileged e-mails and attachment, which we have marked, separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the district may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails and attachment under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. In that instance, the marked e-mails and attachment must be released.<sup>3</sup>

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

---

<sup>3</sup>We note the requestor has a right to her own e-mail address under section 552.137(b). *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(b).

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 cursive script that reads "Paigelay".

Paige Lay  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PL/dls

Ref: ID# 588019

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)