



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 6, 2019

Ms. Mackenzie Walters
Counsel for the Industrial Independent School District
Sara Leon & Associates, L. L. C.
7500 Rialto Boulevard, Building 1, Suite 250
Austin, Texas 78735

OR2019-21621

Dear Ms. Walters:

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# 779048.

The Industrial Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for personnel and training records of certain district employees, contracts pertaining to law enforcement officers, and the names of school resource officers during a specified time period.¹ You state the district has released some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹You state the district sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

²We 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.

Initially, we note Exhibit C consists of completed evaluations that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. Pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1), completed investigations, reports, and evaluations are expressly public unless they are either excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code or confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Although you raise section 552.103 of the Government Code for the information at issue, section 552.103 is a discretionary exception to disclosure and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See id.* § 552.007; *Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 (1999) (governmental body may waive section 552.103). As such, section 552.103 does not make information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, the district may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code for the information at issue. As section 552.101 makes information confidential under the Act, we will consider your argument under this exception for the completed evaluations at issue.

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. Section 21.355 of the Education Code provides, in relevant part, “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential[.]” Educ. Code § 21.355(a). The Third Court of Appeals has concluded a written reprimand constitutes an evaluation for purposes of section 21.355 because “it reflects the principal’s judgment regarding [a teacher’s] actions, gives corrective direction, and provides for further review.” *Abbott v. North East 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. Further, in Open Records Decision No. 643, we determined an “administrator” for purposes of section 21.355 means a person who is required to, and does in fact, hold an administrator’s certificate under subchapter B of chapter 21 of the Education Code, and is performing the functions of an administrator, as that term is commonly defined, at the time of the evaluation. *Id.*

You assert Exhibit C consists of confidential evaluations of teachers and administrators by the district. You inform us, and provide documentation demonstrating, the teachers and administrators at issue were certified as teachers or administrators by the State Board of Educator Certification during the relevant time periods. Further, you state the teachers and administrators at issue were engaged in the process of teaching or performing the functions

of an administrator at the time of the respective evaluations. *See* ORD 643 at 4. Based on these representations and our review, we find the district must withhold Exhibit C under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code.

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). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is 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 prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a).

To establish that 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). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See 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.³ Open Records Decision

³In 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

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. *See* 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).

You claim the district reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the instant request for information. You state the requestor has threatened to bring legal action against the district concerning various alleged violations of law concerning discrimination against the requestor’s child. You also inform us the requestor sought a hearing under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 based on the allegations of discrimination against the requestor’s child. Further, you state, and provide documentation supporting, the requestor filed a complaint against the district with the United States Department of Education’s Office for Civil Rights regarding the alleged discrimination. You assert the information at issue pertains to the alleged discrimination that is the basis of the anticipated litigation. Based on your representations, the submitted documentation, and our review of the information, we find you have established the district reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the request for information, and the information at issue is related to that litigation. Therefore, we find the district may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.⁴

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).

In summary, the district must withhold Exhibit C under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. The district may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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).

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this 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,



Kieran Hillis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KH/jxd

Ref: ID# 779048

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)