



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 12, 2019

Mr. S. Anthony Safi  
Counsel for the El Paso Independent School District  
Mounce, Green, Myers, Safi, Paxson & Galatzan, P.C.  
P.O. Box 1977  
El Paso, Texas 79999-1977

OR2019-18960

Dear Mr. Safi:

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# 775023 (ORR# W001848-041019).

The El Paso Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for the complete personnel file of a named individual, information pertaining to complaints against the named individual, and information pertaining to a specified employment assignment.<sup>1</sup> You state the district is releasing some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

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

---

<sup>1</sup>You state, and provide documentation demonstrating, 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).

<sup>2</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.

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, and submit documentation demonstrating, prior to the date the district received the present request for information, a grievance was filed with the district alleging, among other things, the requestor's client engaged in harassment, discrimination, and retaliation against the grievant. You explain the filing of a grievance initiates the district's grievance policy, which provides for three levels of review, and inform us the administrative hearing process provides for the making of a record for the board of trustees and the Texas Commissioner of Education (the "commissioner"). You provide the district's grievance policy, which demonstrates an employee may have an attorney or representative present at the hearing, hear all adverse evidence, cross-examine adverse witnesses, and present evidence. You state an employee may appeal the board's decision to the commissioner. We understand an employee must exhaust all remedies provided by the district for resolving complaints before the employee may file suit in court. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the district's administrative hearing process is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum and, thus, constitutes litigation for purposes of section

552.103. Thus, we determine the district was involved in pending litigation at the time it received the present request for information. You state the information you marked relates to the pending litigation. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information at issue is related to the pending litigation. Accordingly, we conclude the district may withhold the information you marked 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. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, any information that has either been obtained from or provided to all parties to the pending 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).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from 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 21.355 of the Education Code, which provides, in relevant part, “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential.” Educ. Code § 21.355(a). Additionally, the Third Court of Appeals has concluded a written reprimand constitutes an evaluation for purposes of section 21.355 as it “reflects the principal’s judgment regarding [a teacher’s] actions, gives corrective direction, and provides for further review.” *Abbott v. N. E. Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 212 S.W.3d 364 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.). This office has interpreted section 21.355 to apply to any document that evaluates, as that term is commonly understood, the performance of a teacher or administrator. *See* Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). In Open Records Decision No. 643, we determined for purposes of section 21.355, the word “teacher” means a person who is required to and does in fact hold a teaching certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code and who is in the process of teaching, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *See id.* at 4. Upon review, we note the remaining information at issue pertains to the evaluation of an employee in his capacity as a coach. Thus, we find the district has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue evaluates the performance of a teacher for purposes of section 21.355. Therefore, the district may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code.

In summary, the district may withhold the information you marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining 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](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 "Blake Brennan", written in a cursive style.

Blake Brennan  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

BB/gw

Ref: ID# 775023

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)