



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 27, 2016

Mr. Dustin Chapman  
County Administrator/Legal Counsel  
McLennan County  
P.O. Box 1728  
Waco, Texas 76703-1728

OR2016-14562

Dear Mr. Chapman:

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# 616450.

The McLennan County Judge's Office (the "county") received a request for all communications pertaining to a named individual and all communications sent amongst the county and the named individual. You state you released some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

Initially, the county states some of the submitted information consists of educational records received from an educational institution that are subject to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code. The

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 552.107 of the Government Code, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass other exceptions found in the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

<sup>2</sup>We 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.

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 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>3</sup> Consequently, education records that are responsive to a request for information under the Act should not be submitted 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 county is not an educational agency or institution for purposes of FERPA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 309 at 3 (1983) (City of Fort Worth not an “educational agency” within the meaning of FERPA). However, the county states the information at issue was obtained from an educational institution that created those documents. FERPA contains provisions that govern access to education records that were transferred by an educational agency or institution to a third party. To the extent the information at issue was obtained from an educational institution, so as to be governed by FERPA, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to this information, because our office is prohibited from reviewing education records to determine whether appropriate redactions have been made under FERPA. Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authorities from which education records were obtained. Thus, the county should contact any educational institution from which the information was obtained, as well as the DOE, regarding the applicability of FERPA to this information. To the extent that the information at issue is not governed by FERPA, we will address your arguments against its disclosure.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.107(1). 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.

---

<sup>3</sup>A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General’s website: <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

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).

You state Exhibit B consists of communications involving county attorneys, county officials, and county employees. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the county. You state these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to Exhibit B. Accordingly, the county may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 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). In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of the common-law privacy doctrine to files of an investigation of allegations of sexual harassment. The investigation files in *Ellen* contained individual witness statements, an affidavit by the individual accused of the misconduct responding to the allegations, and conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. *Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating the public’s interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* In concluding, the *Ellen* court held “the public did not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the

---

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of the information at issue.

documents that have been ordered released.” *Id.* Thus, if there is an adequate summary of an investigation of alleged sexual harassment, the investigation summary must be released under *Ellen*, along with the statement of the accused. However, the identities of the victims and witnesses of the alleged sexual harassment must be redacted, and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 393 (1983), 339 (1982). However, when no adequate summary exists, detailed statements regarding the allegations must be released, but the identities of victims and witnesses must still be redacted from the statements. In either case, the identity of the individual accused of sexual harassment is not protected from public disclosure. We also note supervisors are generally not witnesses for purposes of *Ellen*, except where their statements appear in a non-supervisory context.

We note Exhibit C relates to an investigation into alleged sexual harassment. However, we find no portion of Exhibit C constitutes an adequate summary of the investigation. Therefore, the county must generally release Exhibit C. However, this information contains the identifying information of the alleged sexual harassment victims and witnesses, which we marked. Therefore, the county must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and *Ellen*. *See* 840 S.W.2d at 525.

Some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.<sup>5</sup> Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code exempts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, and social security number of a peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(2). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Accordingly, the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.<sup>6</sup>

In summary, to the extent the county determines the requested information consists of “education records” that must be withheld under FERPA, the county must dispose of any such information in accordance with FERPA rather than the Act. The county may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The county must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with

---

<sup>5</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

<sup>6</sup>We note a governmental body may withhold a peace officer’s home address and telephone number, personal cellular telephone and pager numbers, social security number, and family member information under section 552.117(a)(2) without requesting a decision from this office. *See* ORD 670; Gov’t Code § 552.147(b).

common-law privacy and *Ellen*. The county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. The county must release the remaining 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](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,



Meagan J. Conway  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MJC/akg

Ref: ID# 616450

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)