



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 26, 2017

Mr. S. Anthony Safi  
Counsel for El Paso Independent School District  
Mounce, Green, Myers, Safi, Paxson & Galatzan, P.C.  
P.O. Box 1977  
El Paso, Texas 79999

OR2017-22011

Dear Mr. Safi:

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# 682027 (ORR# W000479-080717).

The El Paso Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for e-mails and texts pertaining to specified individuals since January of 2015. The district states it is redacting some information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.<sup>1</sup> The district also states it will withhold information under section 552.024 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> The district informs us it has released some of the requested information, but claims the

---

<sup>1</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 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. We have posted a copy of the letter from the DOE to this office on the Attorney General's website: <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

<sup>2</sup>Section 552.024(c)(2) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting a decision under the Act if the current or former employee or official to whom the information pertains timely chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.024(c)(2).

sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>3</sup>

The Act is applicable only to “public information.” *See id.* §§ 552.002, .021. Section 552.002(a) reads as follows:

(a) In this chapter, “public information” means information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

(1) by a governmental body;

(2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:

(A) owns the information;

(B) has a right of access to the information; or

(C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or

(3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer’s or employee’s official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

*Id.* § 552.002(a). Section 552.002(a-1) also provides the following:

Information is in connection with the transaction of official business if the information is created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by an officer or employee of the governmental body in the officer’s or employee’s official capacity, or a person or entity performing official business or a governmental function on behalf of a governmental body, and pertains to official business of the governmental body.

*Id.* § 552.002(a-1). Thus, virtually all of the information in a governmental body’s physical possession constitutes public information and, thus, is subject to the Act. *Id.* § 552.002(a)(1); *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988). 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.

Act also encompasses information that a governmental body does not physically possess, if the information is collected, assembled, or maintained for the governmental body, and the governmental body owns the information or has a right of access to it. Gov't Code § 552.002(a)(2); *see* Open Records Decision No. 462 at 4 (1987). Further, information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity may be subject to disclosure under the Act if the information pertains to official business of the governmental body. Gov't Code § 552.002(a)(3). Information is "in connection with the transaction of official business" if the information is created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by a person or entity performing official business or a government function on behalf of a governmental body and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body. *See id.* § 552.002(a-1). Moreover, section 552.001 of the Act provides it is the policy of this state that each person is entitled, unless otherwise expressly provided by law, at all times to complete information about the affairs of government and the official acts of public officials and employees. *See id.* § 552.001(a).

We further note the characterization of information as "public information" under the Act is not dependent on whether the requested records are in the possession of an individual or whether a governmental body has a particular policy or procedure that establishes a governmental body's access to the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 635 at 3-4 (1995) (information does not fall outside definition of "public information" in Act merely because individual member of governmental body possesses information rather than governmental body as whole); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 425 (1985) (information sent to individual school trustees' homes was public information because it related to official business of governmental body) (overruled on other grounds by Open Records Decision No. 439 (1986)). Thus, if the information at issue is related to the district's business, the mere fact it is not in the district's possession does not remove the information from the scope of the Act. *See* ORD 635 at 6-8 (information maintained on a privately-owned medium and actually used in connection with the transaction of official business would be subject to the Act).

The district contends the information it has marked under section 552.002 is not public information as defined by that section. The district explain the communications at issue were exchanged on cellular telephones personally owned and paid for by the district employees. It also state the employees at issue occasionally use their personal cellular telephones while performing their job duties. However, the district acknowledges it provides a monthly stipend, in a fixed amount, to help one of the employees at issue "defray the expense 'for the purchase and maintenance of a mobile phone. . . for his business and personal use.'" The district explains the employee at issue personally owns the cellular telephone at issue and is solely responsible for the monthly service charges. However, it asserts the communications at issue are purely personal in nature and do not relate to district business. Upon review, we find the information that the district has marked under section 552.107 relates to the transaction of official district business. Thus, this information constitutes "information that

is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business” by or for the district. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.002(a). Therefore, we conclude this information is subject to the Act and the district must release it, unless the information falls within an exception to public disclosure under the Act. However, we find the remaining information marked under section 552.002 does not constitute public information for purposes of that section. *Cf.* Open Records Decision No. 635 at 7 (1995) (section 552.002 not applicable to personal information unrelated to official business and created or maintained by state employee involving *de minimis* use of state resources). Therefore, with the exception of the information that the district has marked under section 552.107, the information that the district has marked under section 552.002 is not subject to the Act and the district is not required to release it.<sup>4</sup> We will address the arguments against the release of the information that is subject to the Act.

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 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)

---

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address the other arguments of the district to withhold this information.

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 asserts the information it has marked under section 552.107(1) consists of communications between attorneys for the district, employees and officials of the district, and a legal consultant hired by the district that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. It also asserts the communications were intended to be confidential and their confidentiality has been maintained. Upon review, we find the district has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to this information. Therefore, the district may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.<sup>5</sup>

In summary, the district may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The remaining information that the district has marked under section 552.002 is not subject to the Act and the district is not required to release it. 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](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,

  
James L. Coggeshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLC/bw

---

<sup>5</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address the other arguments of the district to withhold this information.

Ref: ID# 682027 (ORR# W000479-080717)

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)