



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 15, 2022

Mr. Coby Wilbanks  
Associate General Counsel and Director of Legal Services  
Fort Bend Independent School District  
16431 Lexington Boulevard  
Sugar Land, Texas 77479

OR2022-39130

Dear Mr. Wilbanks:

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# 990281 (R000716-083122).

The Fort Bend Independent School District (the "district") received a request for employee records of all employees accused of misconduct during a certain time period.<sup>1</sup> You state you will withhold student-identifying information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.<sup>2</sup> You also state you will withhold certain information pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code as permitted by section 552.024(c) of the Government Code and

---

<sup>1</sup> 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).

<sup>2</sup> The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office FERPA 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. The DOE has determined FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the educational records. We have posted a copy of the letter from the DOE on the Attorney General's website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/files/divisions/open-government/20060725-USDOE-FERPA.pdf>

motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.135 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>4</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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides:

[T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, 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 this chapter 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 this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a); *see also id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of this section as 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), 261.001(1) (defining “abuse” for purposes of Family Code ch. 261). We note the district is not an agency authorized to conduct an investigation under chapter 261 of the Family Code. *See id.* § 261.103 (listing agencies that may conduct child abuse investigations). However, we note the Child Protective Services Division of the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (“CPS”) is such an agency. Upon review, we find the submitted information relates to administrative investigations by the district. We understand you to

---

<sup>3</sup> Section 552.117 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.024 of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to withhold information subject to section 552.117 without requesting a decision from this office if the current or former employee or official chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See id.* § 552.024(c)(2). Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See id.* § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e).

<sup>4</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.

claim the information you indicated was submitted to and used by CPS in its investigation. Based on your representations, we find the information we marked consists of information that was used or developed by CPS in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under chapter 261 of the Family Code. Accordingly, 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.<sup>5</sup> See Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime.” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. See *id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); see also *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). We note section 552.108 is generally not applicable to purely administrative records that do not involve the investigation or prosecution of crime. See *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.) (section 552.108 generally not applicable to law enforcement agency’s personnel records); *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525-26 (Tex. Civ. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution); see also Open Records Decision No. 350 at 3-4 (1982). Section 552.108 may be invoked by the proper custodian of information relating to a pending investigation or prosecution of criminal conduct. See Open Records Decision No. 474 at 4-5 (1987). Where an agency has custody of information that would otherwise qualify for exception under section 552.108 as information relating to the pending case of a law enforcement agency, the custodian of the records may withhold the information only if it provides this office with (1) a demonstration the information relates to the pending case, and (2) a representation from the law enforcement agency stating that it wishes to have the information withheld.

You assert section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code for the information at issue. We note section 552.108 applies only to a law enforcement agency or a prosecutor. You do not inform us whether any law enforcement agency has an ongoing criminal investigation or prosecution pertaining to the information at issue. Further, we have not received any representation from a law enforcement agency with an interest in the information explaining why release of the information would interfere with a pending criminal investigation or prosecution. Therefore, we conclude you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code to the remaining information, and the district may not withhold any portion of it on that basis.

---

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

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 the information you indicated consists of privileged communications between an attorney for the district and district employees in their capacities as clients. You state these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district. We understand 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 some of the information at issue. Accordingly, the district may withhold the information we marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. However, we note the rest of the information at issue was shared with a non-privileged party. Therefore, you have failed to establish how the information at issue constitutes privileged attorney-client communications for the purposes of section 552.107(1). Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). You assert some of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.102(a). Upon review, we find the information we marked is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

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 also note parents of students are not informants for purposes of section 552.135. You assert the information you indicated identifies an individual who reported alleged violations of criminal law. Upon review, we conclude the district must withhold the information you indicated under section 552.135.

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 also held common-law privacy protects the identifying information of a juvenile victim of abuse or neglect. *See* Open Records Decision No. 394 (1983); *cf.* Fam. Code § 261.201. Upon review, however, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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>6</sup> *Id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c) of the Government Code. Accordingly, the district must withhold the e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their 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 we marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information you indicated under section 552.135. The district must withhold the e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their disclosure. The district must release the remaining information.<sup>7</sup>

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

---

<sup>6</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).

<sup>7</sup> The information being released contains social security numbers. 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).

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,

Joseph Hoggatt  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JWH/pt

Ref: ID# 990281

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)