



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 1, 2017

Ms. Cynthia Tynan  
Senior Attorney & Public Information Coordinator  
The University of Texas System  
Office of General Counsel  
201 West Seventh Street, Suite 600  
Austin, Texas 78701-2901

OR2017-04405

Dear Ms. Tynan:

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# 647510 (OGC# 173057).

The University of Texas at Austin (the "university") received a request for the requestor's personnel file and any correspondence regarding specified topics, to include communications sent to or from named individuals.<sup>1</sup> You state you will release some information to the requestor. You state you will withhold student-identifying information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.<sup>2</sup> You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.116 of the Government Code. We have

---

<sup>1</sup>You inform us the university sent the requestor an estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.2615. The estimate of charges required the requestor to provide a deposit for payment of anticipated costs under section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.263(a). You also inform us the university received the required deposit on December 6, 2016. *See id.* § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date governmental body receives bond or deposit).

<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>.

considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>3</sup>

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, such as chapter 411 of the Government Code, which makes confidential criminal history record information (“CHRI”) generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center. *See id.* §411.083(a). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI that states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual laws with respect to the CHRI it generates. *See id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI that the Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains, except that DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F, or subchapter E-1 of the Government Code. *See Gov’t Code* § 411.083(a). Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Other entities specified in chapter 411 of the Government Code are entitled to obtain CHRI from DPS or another criminal justice agency; however, those entities may not release CHRI except as provided by chapter 411. *See generally id.* §§ 411.090-.127. Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with chapter 411, subchapter F, of the Government Code. Upon review, we find a portion of the information at issue, which we have marked, consists of CHRI that is confidential under section 411.083. Thus, the university must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code. However, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining information at issue consists of CHRI for purposes of chapter 411 of the Government Code, and the university may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

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

---

<sup>3</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.

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 claim the information you marked is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. You state the information at issue consists of communications involving the university’s attorneys, outside counsel and university employees. You indicate the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the university and that these communications have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information you marked. Thus, the university may generally withhold the e-mails at issue under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, and you acknowledge, some of these e-mail strings include e-mails or attachments received from or sent to a non-privileged party. Furthermore, if the e-mails received from or sent to the non-privileged party are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged e-mails or attachments, which you marked and we marked, are maintained by the university separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the university may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails or attachments under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.116 of the Government Code provides the following:

- (a) An audit working paper of an audit of the state auditor or the auditor of a state agency, an institution of higher education as defined by Section 61.003, Education Code, a county, a municipality, a school district,

a hospital district, or a joint board operating under Section 22.074, Transportation Code, including any audit relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021. If information in an audit working paper is also maintained in another record, that other record is not excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 by this section.

(b) In this section:

(1) "Audit" means an audit authorized or required by a statute of this state or the United States, the charter or an ordinance of a municipality, an order of the commissioners court of a county, the bylaws adopted by or other action of the governing board of a hospital district, a resolution or other action of a board of trustees of a school district, including an audit by the district relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, or a resolution or other action of a joint board described by Subsection (a) and includes an investigation.

(2) "Audit working paper" includes all information, documentary or otherwise, prepared or maintained in conducting an audit or preparing an audit report, including:

(A) intra-agency and interagency communications; and

(B) drafts of the audit report or portions of those drafts.

Gov't Code § 552.116. You state the university is an institution of higher education as defined by section 61.003 of the Education Code. *See* Educ. Code § 61.003. You contend the information you marked was obtained by the university's Office of Internal Audits in furtherance of an audit conducted by the university related to allegations of fraud, waste, and abuse. You inform us audits such as this are authorized by the Texas Internal Auditing Act, chapter 2102 of the Texas Government Code. *See* Gov't Code §§ 2102.003 (defining types of audits), .005 (requiring state agencies to conduct internal audits), .007 (relating to duties of internal auditor). Based on your representations and our review, we agree the information you marked consists of audit working papers as defined in section 552.116(b)(2). Therefore, the university may withhold the information you marked under section 552.116 of the Government Code.

In summary, the university must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code. The university may generally withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, if the non-privileged e-mails or attachments, which you marked and we marked, are maintained by the university separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the university may not withhold these non-privileged

e-mails or attachments under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The university may withhold the information you marked under section 552.116 of the Government Code. The university must release the remaining information.<sup>4</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 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/sb

Ref: ID# 647510

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>4</sup>We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Thus, if the university receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the university must again seek a decision from this office.