



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 15, 2022

Mr. Joey Moore  
Counsel for the Pleasant Grove Independent School District  
Walsh, Gallegos, Trevino, Kyle & Robinson, P.C.  
P.O. Box 2156  
Austin, Texas 78768

OR2022-35609

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# 984462.

The Pleasant Grove Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a named student.<sup>1</sup> You state you released some information. You claim some of the submitted information is exempted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> We have

---

<sup>1</sup> The district provides documentation showing it 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). Additionally, you state the district sent the requestor a cost estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code, and the requestor accepted the cost estimate. *See* Gov't Code § 552.2615. The estimate of charges required the requestor to provide a deposit for payment of anticipated costs under section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.263(a). You also inform us the district received the required payment on August 10, 2022. *See id.* § 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 governmental body receives bond or deposit).

<sup>2</sup> We note, and you acknowledge, the district did not comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e). Nonetheless, because sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider their applicability to the submitted information. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352.

considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>3</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act], and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under [chapter 261 of the Family Code] and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under [chapter 261 of the Family Code] or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Upon review, we find some of the submitted information was used or developed in an investigation conducted under chapter 261 of the Family Code, so as to fall within the scope of section 261.201(a). *See id.* § 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code); *see also id.* § 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of section 261.201 as a person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes). Accordingly, we find this information is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. The district does not indicate it has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information and therefore we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, we conclude the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. *See Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute)*. However, the remaining information at issue consists of administrative records. Thus, we find you have not demonstrated the information at issue consists of a report of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect, nor does the information reveal the identity of an individual who made a report of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect for purposes of section 261.201(a)(1). Furthermore, we find you have failed to demonstrate this information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under

---

<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.

section 261.201(a)(2). Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code.

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.* 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) 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 states some of the remaining information consists of communications involving attorneys for the district, legal staff, and employees in their capacities as clients. The district states these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district. The district states these communications were confidential, and does not indicate the district has waived the confidentiality of the information at issue. Based on these representations and our review, we find the district has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to some of the information at issue, which you marked. Accordingly, the district may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. *Cf. Harlandale Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Cornyn*, 25 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. App.—Austin 2000, pet. denied) (attorney’s entire investigative report

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).

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).<sup>4</sup> *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). We note the requestor has a right to his own e-mail address under section 552.137(b). *Id.* § 552.137(b). The e-mail address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the district must withhold the personal e-mail address we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

In summary, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. The district may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the personal e-mail address we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its 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,

Pearlie Gault  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PG/pt

Ref: ID# 984462

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>4</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 No. 481, 480 (1987), 470 (1987).