



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 12, 2022

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

OR2022-13685

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# 945374 (Ref. No. HC022422B).

The Houston Independent School District (the "district") received a request for certain communications pertaining to specified topics during a stated time period. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, you state some of the responsive information was the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2022-10448 (2022). In that ruling, we determined the district: (1) may withhold certain information under Texas Rule of Evidence 503; (2) may generally withhold certain information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, if the marked non-privileged e-mails are maintained separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, the district must release them; (3) must withhold certain information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code; (4) must withhold certain information under section 552.101 of the

¹ 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.

Government Code in conjunction with section 39.004(e) of the Education Code on behalf of the Texas Education Agency; (5) may withhold the information we marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code; (6) must withhold the cellular telephone number we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code if the employee whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body; and (7) must release the remaining information. We have no indication there has been any change in the law, facts, or circumstances on which the previous ruling was based. Accordingly, to the extent the requested information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, the district may rely on Open Records Letter No. 2022-10448 as a previous determination and withhold or release the responsive information in accordance with that ruling.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). To the extent the responsive information is not encompassed by the previous ruling, we will address the arguments against its disclosure.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. See Gov't Code § 552.107(1). 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). 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.*, 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

² In this instance, as we are able to make this determination, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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 state Exhibit 3 consists of communications involving attorneys for the district and district employees and officials in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district. You state these communications were intended to be, and 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 at issue. Accordingly, the district may withhold Exhibit 3 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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 of the Government Code encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 21.355 of the Education Code. Section 21.355 provides, in relevant part, “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential under [the Act].” 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 administrator. *See Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996)*. In *Open Records Decision No. 643*, we determined an “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 as an administrator, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *Id.*

You state the remaining information consists of confidential evaluations of an administrator by the district. You provide documentation showing the administrator at issue was certified as an administrator by the State Board of Educator Certification and was acting as an administrator at the time the evaluations were prepared. Based on your representations and our review, we find 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 no portion of the remaining information evaluates the performance of a teacher or administrator for purposes of section 21.355. Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body

who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code, except as provided by section 552.024(a-1).³ See 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, the 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. We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal 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) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers 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 only be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee 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. Therefore, if the employee whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the district must withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, if the employee at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024 or the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body, the district may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the requested information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, the district may rely on Open Records Letter No. 2022-10448 as a previous determination and withhold or release the responsive information in accordance with that ruling. The district may withhold Exhibit 3 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. 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. If the employee whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the district must withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. 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.

³ 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 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,

Alexandra C. Burks
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ACB/be

Ref: ID# 945374

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)