



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 7, 2022

Mr. R. Brooks Moore
Deputy General Counsel
The Texas A&M University System
301 Tarrow Street, 6th Floor
College Station, Texas 77840-7896

OR2022-03277

Dear Mr. Moore:

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# 928707 (ORR# F002439-101521).

The Texas A&M University System (the "system") received a request for all records related to three specified topics during a specified time period, a named individual's personnel file, and disciplinary records related to a named individual, including a specified report.¹ You state you do not have information responsive to a portion of the request.² You state you will redact information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.³ See Gov't Code

¹ You state you 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).

² The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. See *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

³ The United States Department of Education Family 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

§§ 552.026 (incorporating FERPA into the Act), .114 (excepting from disclosure “student records”); Open Records Decision No. 539 (1990) (determining the same analysis applies under section 552.114 of the Government Code and FERPA). You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.⁴

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part, as follows:

[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; [and]

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body[.]

Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(1), (3). The submitted information includes a completed investigation report that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The system must release this information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(1). The information at issue also includes information in an account, contract, or voucher relating to the receipt or expenditure of funds by the system that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3). The information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(3). You seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure and do not make information confidential for purposes of the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov’t Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions

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/sites/default/files/files/divisions/open-government/20060725-SDOE-FERPA.pdf>

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.

generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the system may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are “other law” for purposes of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Thus, we will consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. In addition, we will consider your argument for the information not subject to section 552.022.

Texas Rule of Evidence 503(b)(1) provides as follows:

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 it is not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must (1) show 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 the communication is confidential by explaining it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding).

You state the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is attached to privileged communications between system attorneys and system employees and officials. You state the information was communicated in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the system, and was intended to be, and has remained, confidential. Based on these representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. *See Harlandale Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Cornyn*, 25 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. App.—Austin 2000, pet. denied) (concluding attorney’s entire investigative 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 system may withhold the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under Texas Rule of Evidence 503.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See Gov’t Code* § 552.107(1). The elements of the privilege under section 552.107 are the same as those discussed for Texas Rule of Evidence 503. 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. *See ORD 676* at 6-7. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless it 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 inform us the remaining information consists of communications between system attorneys and system employees and officials, that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the system. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the remaining information at issue consists of privileged attorney-client communications and the system may generally withhold the information at issue under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, one of these otherwise privileged e-mail strings include an e-mail and an attachment received from or sent to non-privileged parties. Furthermore, if the e-mail and attachment received from or sent to non-privileged parties are removed from the otherwise privileged e-mail string in which they appear and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if this non-privileged e-mail and attachment, which we have marked, are maintained by the system separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail string in which they appear, then the system may not withhold this non-privileged e-mail and attachment under section 552.107(1).

Section 552.137 of the Government Code 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).⁵ *See Gov’t Code*

⁵ 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).*

§ 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the system 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.

In summary, may withhold the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. The city may generally withhold the remaining information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, if the non-privileged e-mail and attachment, which we have marked, are maintained by the system separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail string in which they appear, then the system may not withhold the non-privileged e-mail and attachment under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The system 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 system 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,

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/eb

Ref: ID# 928707

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)