



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 21, 2019

Ms. Rebecca S. Bailey
Counsel for the Texas City Independent School District
Thompson & Horton, LLP
3200 Southwest Freeway, Suite 2000
Houston, Texas 77027-7528

OR2019-13506

Dear Ms. Bailey:

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# 764962.

The Texas City Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident and specified district policies. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.114 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office has informed this office the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code, 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

¹We note although you also raise section 552.026 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure, this section is not an exception to public disclosure under the Act. Rather, section 552.026 provides the Act does not require the release of information contained in education records except in conformity with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974. Gov't Code § 552.026.

the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act.² 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 redacted 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 submitted records. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A); 34 C.F.R. § 99.3; *see also Equal Employment Opportunity Comm’n v. City of Orange, Tex.*, 905 F. Supp. 381, 382 (E.D. Tex. 1995) (holding 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.³ Accordingly, we do not address your argument under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with FERPA. Likewise, we do not address your argument under section 552.114 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.026 (incorporating FERPA into the Act), .114 (excepting from disclosure “student records”); Open Records Decision No. 539 (1990) (determining the same analysis applies under section 552.114 of the Government Code and FERPA). However, we will address your argument under section 552.103 of the Government Code against disclosure of 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 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

²A 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>.

³In the future, if the district does obtain parental or an adult student’s consent to submit unredacted 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.

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 governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documentation sufficient to establish section 552.103 is applicable in a particular situation. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate 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 the pending or anticipated 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 (1990). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

The question of 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 provide this office “concrete evidence showing the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body’s receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party.⁴ Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). On the other hand, this office has determined 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). We also note 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You assert the submitted information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code. You state a parent of one of the students involved in the incident specified in the request “stated that they may be filing a lawsuit against the [d]istrict[.]” You also state the requestor may be the parent’s attorney, but the district “has not received a notice of representation letter to that effect.” However, you do not inform our office that, prior to district’s receipt of the present request, any party had taken any concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation regarding the incident. Further, you have not demonstrated the


⁴In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

requestor or any parent of the involved students made any specific threat to sue the district. Consequently, we find you have failed to demonstrate the district reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the present request for information. Therefore, the district may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Accordingly, the district must release the submitted 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 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/eb

Ref: ID# 764962

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)