



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 5, 2016

Mr. Orlando "Jay" Juarez, Jr.
Counsel for the United Independent School District
J. Cruz & Associates, LLC
216 West Village Boulevard, Suite 202
Laredo, Texas 78041

OR2016-10254

Dear Mr. Juarez:

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# 608877.

The United Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for two specified investigation files and specified e-mails. The district indicates it will release some information. The district claims the remaining submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions the district claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note 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 or an adult student's consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for

¹Although the district also raises Texas Rule of Evidence 503, we note the proper exception to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is section 552.107 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002), 676 at 1-2 (2002).

the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act.² 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"). The district has submitted both redacted and unredacted education records for our review. The district states the requestor represents the parent of the student whose identifying information is at issue. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these education records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted records, except to note parents and their representatives have a right of access under FERPA to their children's education records. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A); 34 C.F.R. § 99.3. This statutory right of access prevails over a claim under section 552.103 of the Government Code. *See* 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); *see also Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n v. City of Orange, Tex.*, 905 F. Supp. 381, 382 (E.D. Tex. 1995) (FERPA prevails over inconsistent provision of state law). The DOE has informed us, however, that 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 the district's assertions of this privilege under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We will also consider the district's claimed exceptions to the extent the requestor does not have a right of access to the submitted information under FERPA.

Next, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which 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 contains information subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The district must release this information unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although the district raises section 552.103 of the Government Code for the information at issue, this is a discretionary exception to disclosure

²A 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>.

and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See id.* § 552.007; *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 section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 (1999) (governmental body may waive section 552.103). Therefore, none of the information at issue may be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code. As the district raises no further exceptions against disclosure of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1), which we have marked, the district must release this 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. ORD 676 at 6-7. 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 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 information it seeks to withhold in Exhibit A consists of communications between an attorney for the district and district employees in their capacities

as clients. The district states these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district. The district states the confidentiality of these communications has been maintained. Based on these representations and our review, we find the district has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, with the exception of the information the district has marked for release, the district may withhold Exhibit A under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.³

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in part,

(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 that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documentation sufficient to establish the applicability of this exception to the information that it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body receives the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to the pending or anticipated 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). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

This office has long held that for the purposes of section 552.103, “litigation” includes “contested cases” conducted in a quasi-judicial forum. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 474 (1987), 368 (1983), 336 (1982), 301 (1982). Likewise, “contested cases” conducted under the Texas Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 2001 of the Government Code, constitute

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the district’s remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

"litigation" for purposes of section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 588 (1991) (concerning former State Board of Insurance proceeding), 301 (concerning hearing before Public Utilities Commission). In determining whether an administrative proceeding is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum, some of the factors this office considers are whether the administrative proceeding provides for discovery, evidence to be heard, factual questions to be resolved, the making of a record, and whether the proceeding is an adjudicative forum of first jurisdiction with appellate review of the resulting decision without a re-adjudication of fact questions. *See* ORD 588.

The remaining information in Exhibit B pertains to two grievances filed with the district by the requestor's client. The district explains grievances filed with the district are "litigation" because the district follows administrative procedures in handling such disputes. The district states the district's grievance process is a multi-level hearing process wherein a grievance is heard by a district administrator, a district hearing officer, and the district's Board of Trustees. The district explains during these hearings the grievant is allowed to be represented by counsel and present evidence to the district. The district states the grievant must complete the district's grievance process in order to exhaust his administrative remedies before he can appeal to either the Texas Commissioner of Education or a court of competent jurisdiction. Based on these representations and our review, we find the district has demonstrated the district's administrative procedure for disputes is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum and, thus, constitutes litigation for purposes of section 552.103.

The district claims the remaining information in Exhibit B is protected by section 552.103 of the Government Code. The district informs us, and the submitted documentation demonstrates, the grievances at issue were filed prior to and were still pending on the date the district received the requests for information. Thus, we determine the district was involved in pending litigation at the time it received the instant requests with respect to these grievances. The district states, and we agree, the information at issue directly relates to the subject of the pending litigation. Therefore, we conclude the district has demonstrated the applicability of section 552.103 of the Government Code to the information at issue. Accordingly, the district may withhold the remaining information in Exhibit B under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Generally, 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. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the pending 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 concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, the district must release the information we have marked under section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. With the exception of the information the

district has marked for release, the district may withhold Exhibit A under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The district may withhold the remaining information in Exhibit B under section 552.103 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,



Rahat Huq
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RSH/som

Ref: ID# 608877

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)