



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 18, 2017

Ms. Elizabeth G. Neally
Counsel for the Los Fresnos Consolidated Independent School District
Walsh Gallegos Trevino Russo & Kyle, PC
P. O. Box 460606
San Antonio, Texas 78246-0606

OR2017-15961

Dear Ms. Neally:

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# 666624.

The Los Fresnos Consolidated Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for a specified memo pertaining to a named individual. You state you have redacted information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a).¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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

¹The 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/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

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.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information relating to litigation through discovery procedures. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4-5 (1990). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception applies in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the requested information is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4. The governmental body must meet both parts of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

This office has long held that "litigation," for purposes of section 552.103, includes "contested cases" conducted in a quasi-judicial forum. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 474 (1987), 368 (1983), 336 (1982), 301 (1982). In determining whether an administrative proceeding is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum, some of the factors this office considers are whether the administrative proceeding provides for discovery, evidence to be heard, factual questions to be resolved, the making of a record, and whether the proceeding is an adjudicative forum of first jurisdiction with appellate review of the resulting decision without a re-adjudication of fact questions. *See* Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991).

You state three days after the named individual was terminated, the district received a letter from the requestor stating he was retained by the named individual due to his termination. You also state this letter alleges the named individual is being wrongfully terminated, discusses the termination at issue, and concludes the requestor wants the named individual's contract to be renewed. You state the district received the instant request for information on the same day as this letter. You explain the named individual has the right to file a grievance concerning his termination within 15 days of his termination, and grievances filed with the district are "litigation" in that the district follows administrative procedures in handling such disputes. You state the district's grievance process includes a multi-level process in front

of various administrators and, ultimately, the district's board of trustees. You explain during a hearing, the grievant is allowed to be represented by counsel and to present evidence to the district. You further state the grievant must complete the district's grievance process in order to exhaust all administrative remedies before filing suit. Based on your representations and our review, we find the district's administrative procedure for disputes, as described above, is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum. Thus, the district's administrative procedure for disputes constitutes litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Based on your representations, our review, and the totality of the circumstances, we determine the district has established it reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the request for information. Further, we find the submitted information is related to the anticipated litigation. Accordingly, we find the district may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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

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 http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Meredith L. Coffman', with a long, sweeping underline that extends to the right.

Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/tdw

Ref: ID# 666624

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)