



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 8, 2020

Mr. John Wilder  
Counsel for the Anna Independent School District  
Walsh Gallegos Trevino Russo & Kyle, P.C.  
P.O. Box 168046  
Irving, Texas 75016

OR2020-30604

Dear Mr. Wilder:

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# 856196.

The Anna Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all records related to a specified investigation. The district states it is releasing some of the requested information. The district claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the district claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office has informed this office the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code, does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental or an adult student's consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act.<sup>1</sup> Consequently, state and local educational authorities that receive a request for education records from a member of the public under the Act must not submit education records to this office in unredacted form, that is, in a form in which "personally identifiable information" is disclosed. *See* 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining "personally identifiable information"); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 224 (1979) (student's handwritten comments protected under

---

<sup>1</sup> A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

FERPA because they would make identity of student easily traceable through handwriting, style of expression, or particular incidents related in the comments). The district has submitted education records for our review. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these education records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted records, other than to note parents and their legal representatives have a right of access to their child's education records. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A); 34 C.F.R. § 99.3; Open Records Decision No. 431 (1985); *see also Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n v. City of Orange, Tex.*, 905 F. Supp. 381, 382 (E.D. Tex. 1995) (holding FERPA prevails over inconsistent provision of state law). Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records.<sup>2</sup> The DOE also has informed our office, however, a parent's right of access under FERPA to information about the parent's child does not prevail over an educational institution's right to assert the attorney-client privilege. Thus, we will consider the district's argument under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

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

---

<sup>2</sup> In the future, if the district does obtain parental consent to submit education records and the district seeks a ruling from this office on the proper redaction of those education records in compliance with FERPA, we will rule accordingly.

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).

The district claims the submitted information is protected by section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The district states the information at issue consists of communications involving the district's attorneys and outside counsel and district employees in their capacities as clients. The district states the communications were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the district and that these communications have remained confidential. Based on these representations and our review, we find the district has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the district may generally withhold the e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, these e-mail strings include e-mails that were exchanged with the requestor's attorney, who is not a 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 the submitted e-mails that were exchanged with the requestor's attorney are maintained by the district separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the district may not withhold the non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

We note the non-privileged e-mails contain an e-mail address that is subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a 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 Gov't Code* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the district must withhold the personal e-mail address within the non-privileged e-mails under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

In summary, the district may generally withhold the submitted e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, if the submitted e-mails that were exchanged with the requestor's attorney are maintained by the district separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the district may not withhold the non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. In releasing any non-privileged e-mails, the district must withhold the personal e-mail address within those e-mails under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

---

<sup>3</sup> The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See Open Records Decision* Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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,

Claire V. Morris Sloan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CVMS/mo

Ref: ID# 856196

c: Requestor