



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 29, 2019

Mr. Guillermo R. Garcia  
Counsel for the Laredo Independent School District  
Kazen, Meurer & Perez, L.L.P.  
P.O. Box 6237  
Laredo, Texas 78042

OR2019-14129

Dear Mr. Garcia:

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# 767719.

The Laredo Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for pending grievance against the district during a specified time period. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, and 552.135 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege and the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, you provide no arguments explaining how this doctrine and this law are applicable to the information at issue. Therefore, we assume you no longer assert these arguments. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

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”). You have 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 submitted records. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A). Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. However, we will consider your arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.

Next, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body[.]

Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(3). The submitted information includes information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of funds by a governmental body that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3). The district must release this information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(3), unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although the district raises section 552.103 of the Government Code for this information, section 552.103 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit*, 4 S.W.3d at 475-76 (governmental body may waive section 552.103); ORDs 665 at 2 n.5 (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3), which we have marked, under section 552.103. However, as sections 552.101 and 552.102 make information confidential under the Act, we will consider your arguments under sections 552.101 and 552.102 for the information subject to section 552.022. We will also address your arguments against disclosure of the remaining 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>.

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

(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.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A 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 (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. *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). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551.

This office has long held "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, prior to the district's receipt of the instant request, the submitted grievances were filed with the district. You explain grievances filed with the district are "litigation" in that the district follows administrative procedures in handling such disputes. You state the district's policy includes a three-level process wherein a hearing officer hears the grievance at each level and resolves factual issues. You also explain during this process, discovery takes place and evidence is heard at each level. You further state if the grievant is not satisfied after the third grievance level, "the matter may be appealed to the Texas Education Agency, and ultimately a court of law." 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. The submitted information reflects the grievances at issue were filed prior to the district's receipt of this request for information and the matters are still pending in the district's administrative grievance process. Thus, we determine the district was involved in pending litigation at the time it received the request for information. You state the information at issue relates to the pending litigation against the district. Upon review of your arguments and the information at issue, we find the information at issue is related to litigation involving the district that was pending on the date the request was received. Accordingly, we find the district may generally withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note, however, the opposing parties have seen or had access to some of the information at issue. The purpose of section 552.103 of the Government Code is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties seeking information relating to the litigation to obtain such information through discovery procedures. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5. Thus, once the opposing party in pending litigation has seen or had access to information that is related to the litigation, there is no interest in withholding such information from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320(1982). Accordingly, the district may not withhold the information seen by any of the opposing parties, which we have marked for release, under section 552.103. However, the district may withhold the remaining information that is not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> We note the applicability of section 552.103 ends once the related litigation concludes. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 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. 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 no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern, and the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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). You assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which is discussed above. See *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert*’s interpretation of section 552.102(a), and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. See *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts*, 354 S.W.3d 336. The supreme court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. See *id.* at 348. You assert the remaining information is protected by section 552.102. Upon review, however, we find no portion of the information at issue is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the district may not withhold any of the remaining information 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, individuals who provide information in the course of an investigation, but do not make the initial report are not informants for purposes of section 552.135 of the Government Code. You assert some of the remaining information identifies students and employees who reported an alleged violation of criminal and civil laws. However, upon review, we find the district failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information reveals the identity of an informer for the purposes of section 552.135 of the Government Code. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information on that ground.

In summary, the district must release the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code. Except for the information we have marked for release, the district may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Meredith L. Coffman', with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Meredith L. Coffman  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MLC/mo

Ref: ID# 767719

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)