



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 5, 2022

Mr. Victor I. Cerda
Counsel for the Socorro Independent School District
Escamilla & Poneck, LLP
700 North Saint Mary's Street, Suite 850
San Antonio, Texas 78205

OR2022-37602

Dear Mr. Cerda:

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# 983575.

The Socorro Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for communications between named individuals containing specified keywords during a defined period of time.¹ We understand the district to state it is withholding social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.² You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103,

¹ You state the district 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 Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. See Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

552.107, and 552.108 of the Government Code.³ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.⁴

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 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 assert portions of the submitted information consist of communications between attorneys for the district and district employees and officials that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the district. You state the 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

³ Although the district also raises section 552.117 of the Government Code, the district has not provided any arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we assume the district has withdrawn its claim this section applies to the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

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.

information at issue. Accordingly, the district may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.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. This section encompasses article 20A.202(a) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which provides “[g]rand jury proceedings are secret.” Crim. Proc. Code art. 20A.202(a). However, article 20A.202 does not define “proceedings” for purposes of subsection (a). The Fourth Court of Appeals in *In re Reed* addressed the issue of what constitutes “proceedings” for purposes of the statutory predecessor of article 20A.202 and stated the term “proceedings” could “reasonably be understood as encompassing matters that take place before the grand jury, such as witness testimony and deliberations.” *See In re Reed*, 227 S.W.3d 273, 276 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2007, orig. proceeding).

Subsequent to the ruling in *Reed*, the 80th Legislature, modeling federal law, added the statutory predecessor to subsection (b) of article 20A.202. *See* Crim. Proc. Code art. 20A.202; FEDED. R. CRIM. P. 6(e)(6) (“Records, orders, and subpoenas relating to grand jury proceedings must be kept under seal to the extent and as long as necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of a matter occurring before a grand jury.”). Article 20A.202(b) states “[a] subpoena or summons relating to a grand jury proceeding or investigation must be kept secret to the extent and for as long as necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of a matter before the grand jury.” Crim. Proc. Code art. 20A.202(b). However, this provision does not define or explain what factors to consider in making such a determination, and even if we considered article 20A.202 to be a confidentiality provision, information withheld under this statute would be secret only “for as long as necessary to prevent the unauthorized disclosure of a matter before the grand jury.” *Id.*

The district seeks to withhold some of the remaining information under article 20A.202. However, we conclude the district has not explained how the matters upon which the information at issue were based are still “before the grand jury” to warrant keeping the information secret. Thus, upon review of article 20A.202 and related case law, it is not apparent, and the district has failed to otherwise explain, how this provision makes the information at issue confidential. *See* Open Records Decision No. 478 (1987) (as general rule, statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential). Therefore, the district may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with article 20A.202 of the Criminal Code of Procedure.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

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

(1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]

...

(b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1). A governmental body raising section 552.108 must explain the applicability of section 552.108. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). You do not inform us the remaining information pertains to a specific ongoing criminal investigation or prosecution and we find you have not demonstrated any portion of its release would interfere in some way with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108(a)(1) or section 552.108(b)(1). Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Id. § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of section 552.103 to the information it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate: (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to

be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).

Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To demonstrate litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *Id.* This office has found a pending complaint with the Equal Opportunity Employment Commission (“EEOC”) indicates litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 386 at 2 (1983), 336 at 1 (1982), 281 at 1 (1981).

You state, and provide documentation showing, prior to the district’s receipt of the instant request, an employee filed discrimination claims against the district with the EEOC. Based on your arguments and our review of the remaining information, we find the district reasonably anticipated litigation on the date this request was received. You also state the information you have indicated pertains to the substance of the discrimination claims. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information you have indicated is related to the anticipated litigation. Therefore, the district may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.103 of the Government Code.⁶

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation though discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to all parties to the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

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. This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information, which we have marked, satisfies the

⁶ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.⁷ However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part:

- (a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient’s behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(a)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This office has concluded the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). Upon review, we find the district has not demonstrated any portion of the remaining information consists of medical records for purposes of the MPA, and the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Family and Medical Leave Act (the “FMLA”). *See* 29 U.S.C. §§ 2601 *et seq.* Section 825.500 of chapter V of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations identifies the record-keeping requirements for employers that are subject to the FMLA. Subsection (g) of section 825.500 states:

Records and documents relating to medical certifications, recertifications or medical histories of employees or employees’ family members, created for purposes of FMLA, shall be maintained as confidential medical records in separate files/records from the usual personnel files. . . . If the [Americans

⁷ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

with Disabilities Act (the “ADA”)], as amended, is also applicable, such records shall be maintained in conformance with ADA confidentiality requirements . . . , except that:

- (1) Supervisors and managers may be informed regarding necessary restrictions on the work or duties of an employee and necessary accommodations;
- (2) First aid and safety personnel may be informed (when appropriate) if the employee’s physical or medical condition might require emergency treatment; and
- (3) Government officials investigating compliance with FMLA (or other pertinent law) shall be provided relevant information upon request.

29 C.F.R. § 825.500(g). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is confidential under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 825.500(g) of the Code of Federal Regulations, and the district may not withhold it on this basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (the “ADA”). *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 12101 et seq. Title I of the ADA provides that information about the medical conditions and medical histories of applicants or employees must be (1) collected and maintained on separate forms, (2) kept in separate medical files, and (3) treated as a confidential medical record. Information obtained in the course of a “fitness for duty examination” conducted to determine whether an employee is still able to perform the essential functions of his or her job is to be treated as a confidential medical record as well. *See* 29 C.F.R. § 1630.14(c); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 641 (1996). Furthermore, the federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (the “EEOC”) has determined that medical information for the purposes of the ADA includes “specific information about an individual’s disability and related functional limitations, as well as general statements that an individual has a disability or that an ADA reasonable accommodation has been provided for a particular individual.” *See* Letter from Ellen J. Vargyas, Legal Counsel, EEOC, to Barry Kearney, Associate General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, 3 (Oct. 1, 1997). Federal regulations define “disability” for the purposes of the ADA as “(1) a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of the individual; (2) a record of such an impairment; or (3) being regarded as having such an impairment.” 29 C.F.R. § 1630.2(g). The regulations further provide that physical or mental impairment means: (1) any physiological disorder, or condition, cosmetic disfigurement, or anatomical loss affecting one or more of the following body systems: neurological, musculoskeletal, special sense organs, respiratory (including speech organs), cardiovascular, reproductive, digestive, genito-urinary, hemic and lymphatic, skin, and endocrine; or (2) any mental or psychological disorder, such as mental retardation, organic brain syndrome, emotional or mental illness, and specific learning disabilities. *See id.* § 1630.2(h). Upon review, we find the district has failed to

demonstrate the ADA is applicable to any portion of the remaining information, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.135 of the Government Code provides in relevant part the following:

(a) “Informer” means a student or a former student or an employee or former employee of a school district who has furnished a report of another person’s or persons’ possible violation of criminal, civil, or regulatory law to the school district or the proper regulatory enforcement authority.

(b) An informer’s name or information that would substantially reveal the identity of an informer is excepted from [required public disclosure].

(c) Subsection (b) does not apply:

(1) if the informer is a student or former student, and the student or former student, or the legal guardian, or spouse of the student or former student consents to disclosure of the student’s or former student’s name; or

(2) if the informer is an employee or former employee who consents to disclosure of the employee’s or former employee’s name; or

(3) if the informer planned, initiated, or participated in the possible violation.

Gov’t Code § 552.135(a)-(c). Because the legislature limited the protection of section 552.135 to the identity of a person who reports a possible violation of “law,” a school district that seeks to withhold information under that exception must clearly identify to this office the specific civil, criminal, or regulatory law that is alleged to have been violated. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A). Additionally, witnesses and other individuals who provide information in the course of an investigation are not informants for purposes of section 552.135 of the Government Code. We understand you to assert some of the remaining information identifies students and employees who reported alleged violations of criminal and civil laws. Upon review, however, we find the district has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue reveals the identity of an informer for purposes of section 552.135 of the Government Code. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

In summary, the district may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The district may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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,

Colin Henry
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CEH/pt

Ref: ID# 983575

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)