



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 23, 2020

Ms. Katheryne Ellison
Assistant General Counsel
Houston Independent School District
4400 West 18th Street
Houston, Texas 77092-8501

OR2020-02080

Dear Ms. Ellison:

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# 807417 (File# W092719).

The Houston Independent School District (the "district") received a request for six categories of information related to the district's special education department.¹ You state the district will release some information. You state the district will rely on Open Records Letter No. 2019-28429 (2019) and withhold or release some of the requested information in accordance with that ruling.² We understand the district has withheld social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(a-1) of the Government Code.³ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the

¹ You inform us the requestor was required to make a deposit for payment of anticipated costs for the request under section 552.263 of the Government Code, which the district received on October 25, 2019. *See* Gov't Code § 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 that governmental body receives deposit or bond).

² *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure).

³ The social security number of an employee of a school district in the custody of the district is confidential. Gov't Code § 552.147(a-1). A governmental body may redact the social security number of a living person from any information the governmental body discloses under section 552.021 without the necessity of requesting a decision from the attorney general. *Id.*

Government Code and privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence and rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.⁴

Initially, you state Exhibit 4 is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). We note Exhibits 4 and 5 consist of completed investigations subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The district must release the completed investigations pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless they are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(1). *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 8 (2002) (attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 may be waived), 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). The Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence and Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are “other law” that make information expressly confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege and the attorney work product privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, respectively. Additionally, you raise section 552.101 for this information, which makes information confidential under the Act. Accordingly, we will also consider the applicability of section 552.101 to Exhibits 4 and 5.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses section 2000e-5 of title 42 of the United States Code, which provides, in relevant part:

Whenever a charge is filed by or on behalf of a person claiming to be aggrieved . . . alleging that an employer . . . has engaged in an unlawful employment practice, the [EEOC] shall serve a notice of the charge . . . and shall make an investigation thereof Charges shall not be made public by the [EEOC]. . . .

⁴ 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.

42 U.S.C. § 2000e-5(b) (emphasis added). This office has held section 2000e-5 only restricts disclosure by those who enforce the Equal Employment Opportunity Act and does not make information in the hands of the state reporting agency confidential. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 245 at 2 (1980) (City of Rio Hondo may not withhold information under section 2000e-5 or 2000e-7 of title 42 of the United States Code), 155 at 2 (1977) (City of Austin may not withhold information under section 2000e-5), 59 at 2 (1974) (Dallas County may not withhold information under section 2000e-8); *see also Whitaker v. Carney*, 778 F.2d 216 (5th Cir. 1985) (title VII proscribes release of information only when held by EEOC or EEOC employees, and not when held by employer). You claim Exhibits 2 and 3 are confidential under section 2000e-5 of title 42 of the United States Code. However, the information at issue is maintained by the district and not by employees of the EEOC. Therefore, we conclude the district may not withhold any of the submitted information pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 2000e-5 of title 42 of the United States Code.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides the following:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or the client's representative and the client's lawyer or the lawyer's representative;

(B) between the client's lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

(C) by the client, the client's representative, the client's lawyer, or the lawyer's representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer's representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;

(D) between the client's representatives or between the client and the client's representative; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is "confidential" if not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client or reasonably necessary to transmit the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must 1) show that the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; 2) identify

the parties involved in the communication; and 3) show that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. *See* ORD 676. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the entire communication is confidential under rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the communication does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 503(d). *Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein); *In re Valero Energy Corp.*, 973 S.W.2d 453, 457 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1998, orig. proceeding) (privilege attaches to complete communication, including factual information).

You state Exhibit 4 consists of a privileged communication involving district counsel and district employees that was made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You state the communication was intended to be, and has remained, confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find Exhibit 4 consists of a privileged attorney-client communication. *See Harlandale Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Cornyn*, 25 S.W.3d 238 (Tex. App.—Austin 2000, pet. denied) (concluding attorney's entire investigation report was protected by attorney-client privilege where attorney was retained to conduct investigation in her capacity as attorney for purpose of providing legal services and advice). Accordingly, the district may withhold Exhibit 4 under Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1).⁵

Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 encompasses the attorney work product privilege. Rule 192.5 defines work product as

(1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or

(2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party's representatives or among a party's representatives, including the party's attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a). A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party's representative. *Id.* 192.5; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that

a) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue; and b) the party resisting discovery

⁵ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation.

Nat'l Tank Co. v. Brotherton, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A "substantial chance" of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather "that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear." *Id.* at 204; ORD 677 at 7.

Furthermore, if a requestor seeks a governmental body's entire litigation file, the governmental body may assert the file is excepted from disclosure in its entirety because such a request implicates the attorney work product privilege. *See* ORD 677 at 5-6. Thus, in such a situation, if the governmental body demonstrates the file was created in anticipation of litigation, this office will presume the entire file is within the scope of the privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 647 at 5 (1996) (organization of attorney's litigation file necessarily reflects attorney's thought processes (citing *Nat'l Union Fire Ins. Co. v. Valdez*, 863 S.W.2d 458, 461 (Tex. 1993))); *see also* *Curry v. Walker*, 873 S.W.2d 379, 380 (Tex. 1994) (holding "the decision as to what to include in [the file] necessarily reveals the attorney's thought processes concerning the prosecution or defense of the case").

The district argues Exhibit 6 consists of privileged attorney work product. Upon review, we find the district has not demonstrated any of the information at issue consists of attorney work product, and the district may not withhold any of Exhibit 6 under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 21.355 of the Education Code. Section 21.355(a) provides that "[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential." Educ. Code § 21.355(a). This office has interpreted section 21.355 to apply to any document that evaluates, as that term is commonly understood, the performance of a teacher or an administrator. *See* Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). We have determined that "administrator," for purposes of section 21.355, means a person who is required to and does in fact hold an administrator's certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code and is performing the functions of an administrator, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *Id.*

The district contends Exhibit 5 consists of documents that evaluate the performance of a certified administrator. We understand the administrator at issue was acting in her capacity as an administrator when the evaluative document was created. Upon review, we conclude the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. However, we find the district has failed to demonstrate the remaining information consists of documents evaluating the performance of an administrator for purposes of section 21.355 of the Education Code. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.”⁶ Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court has held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Upon review, we find the district must withhold the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) 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 who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code, except as provided by section 552.024(a-1). Gov’t Code §§ 552.117(a)(1), .024. Section 552.024(a-1) of the Government Code provides, “A school district may not require an employee or former employee of the district to choose whether to allow public access to the employee’s or former employee’s social security number.” *Id.* § 552.024(a-1). Thus, a school district may only withhold under section 552.117 the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of the district who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. Section 552.117 is applicable to cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (statutory predecessor to section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers provided and paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body’s receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body’s receipt of the request for the information. Accordingly, if the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the cellular telephone numbers may only be withheld if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s or driver’s license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. Gov’t Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the district must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a

⁶ The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address of a vendor who seeks to contract with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body on a letterhead. *See id.* § 552.137(c). Upon review, we find the district must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.


We understand the district to assert some of the remaining information is protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy. 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 intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. We note, however, the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 542 (1990); 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees); 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees); 432 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). We note the fact that a public employee is sick is public information, but specific information about illnesses is excepted from disclosure. *See* ORD 470 at 4. Upon review, the district has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the district may withhold Exhibit 4 under Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1). The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. The district must withhold the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. If the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the cellular telephone numbers may only be withheld if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. The district must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,


Kelly McWethy
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KM/jxd

Ref: ID# 807417

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)