



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 28, 2015

Ms. Jeanne C. Collins
General Counsel
El Paso Independent School District
6531 Boeing Drive
El Paso, Texas 79925

OR2015-22632

Dear Ms. Collins:

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# 584721 (EPISD ORR #2015.327).

The El Paso Independent School District (the "district") received a request for information pertaining to the requestor's client. You state the district has released some of the requested information. You state the district has redacted student-identifying information from the submitted documents pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107 and 552.135 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed 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

¹The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office FERPA does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental or student 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 FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

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 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 the information submitted as Exhibit B consists of communications between outside counsel for the district and district employees in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You state these communications were not intended to be disclosed to third parties 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 district may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Section 261.201 of the Family Code provides, in part, as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). The district is not an agency authorized to conduct a chapter 261 investigation. *See* Act of May 29, 2015, 84th Leg., R.S., ch. 734, § 80, 2015 Tex. Sess. Law Serv. 2218, 2243 (Vernon) (to be codified as an amendment to Fam. Code § 261.103). Nevertheless, some of remaining information relates to investigations of alleged or suspected child abuse conducted by the El Paso Police Department and the Child Protective Services Division of the Texas Department of Family Protective Services. *See id.* § 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes); Act of June 1, 2015, 84th Leg., R.S., ch. 1273, § 4, 2015 Tex. Sess. Law Serv. 4310, 4312 (to be codified as an amendment to Fam. Code § 261.001(1)) (defining “abuse” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). Additionally, some of the remaining information identifies an individual who made a report of alleged or suspected abuse under chapter 261. Therefore, we find this information is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. Accordingly, we conclude the information we have marked is confidential pursuant to section 261.201(a) of the Family Code, and the district must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code.² *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute). However, the remaining information pertains to an administrative investigation by the district. Therefore, the district may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family 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

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

highly intimate or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy," which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common-law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490, 492 (5th Cir. 1985)). After review of the remaining information, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of constitutional privacy.

Section 552.135 of the Government Code provides the following:

- (a) "Informer" means a student or former student or an employee or former employee of a school district who has furnished a report of another person's possible violation of criminal, civil, or regulatory law to the school district or the proper regulatory enforcement authority.
- (b) An informer's name or information that would substantially reveal the identity of an informer is excepted from [required public disclosure].

Gov't Code § 552.135. Because the legislature limited the protection of section 552.135 to the identity of a person who reports a possible violation of "law," a school district that seeks to withhold information under the exception must clearly identify to this office the specific civil, criminal, or regulatory law that is alleged to have been violated. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A). Additionally, individuals who provide information in the course of the investigation, but do not report a violation of law are not informants for purposes of section 552.135 of the Government Code. Upon review, we find the district has not demonstrated any of the remaining information identifies an informer for the purposes of section 552.135. Therefore, we find the district may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.135 of the Government Code.

In summary, the district may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. The district 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, 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 "N. A. Ybarra".

Nicholas A. Ybarra
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NAY/bhf

Ref: ID# 584721

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)