



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 14, 2019

Ms. Elizabeth G. Neally  
Counsel for the Harlingen Consolidated Independent School District  
Walsh, Gallegos, Trevino, Russo & Kyle, P.C.  
P.O. Box 460606  
San Antonio, Texas 78246

OR2019-12949

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# 765420.

The Harlingen Consolidated Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for all information pertaining to a named student, including information related to a specified incident.<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.116 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you state the district has redacted student-identifying information from the submitted documents pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code. 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

---

<sup>1</sup>We note the district sought and received clarification of the information requested. See Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act.<sup>2</sup> Consequently, state and local educational authorities that receive a request for education records from a member of the public under the Act must not submit education records to this office in unredacted form, that is, in a form in which “personally identifiable information” is disclosed. *See* 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining “personally identifiable information”). The district has submitted education records for our review. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these education records to determine whether appropriate redactions under FERPA have been made, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the requested information, except to note parents have a right of access under FERPA to their children’s education records. *See* 20 U.S.C. 1232g(a)(1)(A); 34 C.F.R. § 99.3. This statutory federal right of access prevails over a conflicting state law. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A); 34 C.F.R. § 99.3; Open Records Decision No. 431 (1985) (information subject to right of access under FERPA may not be withheld pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov’t Code § 552.103); *see also Equal Employment Opportunity Comm’n v. City of Orange, Tex.*, 905 F. Supp. 381, 382 (E.D. Tex. 1995) (FERPA prevails over inconsistent provision of state law). Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records.<sup>3</sup> However, we will consider the exceptions you claim to the extent the requestor does not have a right of access to the submitted information pursuant to FERPA.

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.

---

<sup>2</sup>A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General’s website at <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/files/divisions/open-government/20060725-USDOE-FERPA.pdf>.

<sup>3</sup>In the future, if the district does obtain parental or an adult student’s consent to submit education records and the district seeks a ruling from this office on the proper redaction of those education records in compliance with FERPA, we will rule accordingly.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show section 552.103(a) is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *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 (1990). The governmental body must meet both parts of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a). See ORD 551 at 4.

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” See Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body’s receipt of a letter, prior to its receipt of a request for information, containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); see Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. ORD 452 at 4.

You assert the district anticipated litigation upon receipt of the present request for information. You state the requestor is the attorney for the student named in the request and the student’s parents, and this requestor was hired to provide legal counsel pertaining to the incident specified in the request. You further state, and provide documentation showing, simultaneous with the district’s receipt of the instant request for information, the district received a preservation of records notice from the requestor. You also state the submitted information pertains to the student whose information is at issue. Based on your representations, our review of the information, and the totality of the circumstances, we find the district reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the present request for information. We further find the information at issue relates to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Accordingly, to the extent the district determines the requestors do not have a right of access to the information at issue pursuant to FERPA, the district may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

We note the purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information related to litigation through the discovery process. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5. Thus, any information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party 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. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* 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](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,



Blake Brennan  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

BB/gw

Ref: ID# 765420

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)