



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 14, 2016

Ms. Janet Sobey Bubert  
Counsel for Manara Academy  
Brackett & Ellis, P.C.  
100 Main Street  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-3090

OR2016-05842

Dear Ms. Bubert:

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# 601667.

The Manara Academy (the "academy"), which you represent, received a request for all correspondence to or from a named individual or the school board regarding another named individual during a specified time.<sup>1</sup> We understand the academy will release some of the requested information to the requestor. You state the academy is withholding student-identifying information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act

---

<sup>1</sup>You state the academy sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

(“FERPA”), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.<sup>2</sup> You state the academy will withhold information subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code as permitted by section 552.024(c) of the Government Code and e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code and privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. 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). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>4</sup>

Initially, we note the academy seeks to withdraw its request for an open records decision because it asserts the request for information was withdrawn by operation of law when the requestor failed to timely respond to a cost estimate for providing the requested records. Upon review of a copy of the cost estimate, we find it does not comply with the requirements of section 552.2615(a) of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.2615(a). Accordingly, we conclude the request for information was not withdrawn by operation of law. *See id.* § 552.2615(b). We will address the academy’s arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See id.* § 552.107(1). When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the

---

<sup>2</sup>The 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: <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup>Section 552.117 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.024 of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to withhold information subject to section 552.117 without requesting a decision from this office if the current or former employee or official chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See id.* § 552.024(c). We note Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

<sup>4</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.

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 submitted information consists of communications involving attorneys for the academy, academy employees, and members of the academy’s Board of Directors. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the academy. 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 the submitted information. Accordingly, the academy may withhold the submitted information 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](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 'Meagan J. Conway', written over a horizontal line.

Meagan J. Conway  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MJC/akg

Ref: ID# 601667

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)