



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 16, 2019

Mr. W. Montgomery Meitler
Senior Counsel
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

OR2019-22860

Dear Mr. Meitler:

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# 782743 (ORR# 38701).

The Texas Education Agency (the "TEA") received a request for all documents related to a specified case against the requestor. The TEA states it 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.¹ The TEA states it is releasing some of the requested information. The TEA claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions the TEA claims and reviewed the submitted information.

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 exception encompasses section 21.062 of the Education Code, which provides, in part, the following:

¹The 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 student consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act. The DOE has determined FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

(a) During an investigation by the [C]ommissioner [of Education (the “commissioner”)] for an alleged incident of misconduct, the commissioner may issue a subpoena to compel:

...

(2) the production, for inspection or copying, of relevant evidence that is located in this state.

...

(d) All information and materials subpoenaed or compiled in connection with an investigation described by Subsection (a) are confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act].

Educ. Code § 21.062(a)(2), (d). The TEA states some of the submitted information, which it marked, relates to an investigation of an educator by the commissioner for an alleged incident of misconduct. The TEA further states the information at issue was submitted to the TEA in response to a subpoena issued by the commissioner. Based on these representations, we agree the TEA must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.062(d) 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). 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 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. *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.

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office “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 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, or when an individual threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 346 (1982), 288 (1981). 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). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

The TEA states the remaining information is related to an open investigation into allegations that an educator engaged in inappropriate conduct. The TEA states the alleged misconduct may require the TEA to file a petition for sanctions against the educator pursuant to provisions of the Education Code and title 19 of the Texas Administrative Code. *See* Educ. Code §§ 21.031(a) (agency shall regulate and oversee standards of conduct of public school educators), .041(b) (agency shall propose rules providing for disciplinary proceedings); 19 T.A.C. §§ 247.2, 249.15(c). The TEA explains if the educator files an answer to the petition, then the matter will be referred to the State Office of Administrative Hearings for a contested case proceeding. *See* 19 T.A.C § 249.18. The TEA states such proceedings are governed by the Administrative Procedure Act (the “APA”), chapter 2001 of the Government Code. *See* Educ. Code § 21.041(b)(7); 19 T.A.C. § 249.4(a)(1); Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991) (contested case under APA constitutes litigation for purposes of statutory predecessor to section 552.103). Based on these representations and our review, we find the TEA reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the instant request. Further, the TEA explains the remaining information is related to the anticipated litigation because it was compiled for the purpose of investigating the educator’s alleged misconduct. Therefore, we conclude the TEA may withhold the remaining information 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, information

that has either been obtained from or provided to all parties to the pending or anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and 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).

In summary, the TEA must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 21.062(d) of the Education Code. The TEA may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/gw

Ref: ID# 782743

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)