



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

January 26, 2005

Ms. Betsy Hall Bender  
Attorney At Law  
7200 Lamplight Lane  
Austin, Texas 78731

OR2005-00754

Dear Ms. Bender:

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# 217533.

The Schertz-Cibolo-Universal City Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information related to (1) "any and all of the assaults" on a named teacher, and (2) the placement of the teacher and the student accused of the assaults. You state that some responsive information has been provided to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.026, 552.101, 552.103, 552.108, 552.111, and 552.114 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that some of the submitted information constitutes medical records, access to which is governed by the Medical Practice Act ("MPA"), chapter 159 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 provides in pertinent part:

- (b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the district also claims that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.022 of the Government Code, this section is not an exception to disclosure but is instead an illustrative list of types of information that generally cannot be withheld unless confidential by law. See Gov't Code § 552.022.

information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(b), (c). This office has concluded that the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). Further, information that is subject to the MPA also includes information that was obtained from medical records. *See* Occ. Code § 159.002(a), (b), (c); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). The medical records must be released upon the patient's signed, written consent, provided that the consent specifies (1) the information to be covered by the release, (2) reasons or purposes for the release, and (3) the person to whom the information is to be released. Occ. Code §§ 159.004, .005. Section 159.002(c) also requires that any subsequent release of medical records be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. *See* Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). Upon review, we find that some of the documents you have submitted in Exhibit C are medical records subject to the MPA, and may only be released in accordance with that statute. We have marked these records accordingly.

Next, we address your claim under section 552.103 of the Government Code, which provides 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 that 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. *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *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).

To establish that 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." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). 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.<sup>2</sup> Open Records Decision 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). When the governmental body is the prospective plaintiff in litigation, the evidence of anticipated litigation must at least reflect that litigation involving a specific matter is "realistically contemplated." *See* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989); *see also* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982) (investigatory file may be withheld if governmental body's attorney determines that it should be withheld pursuant to Gov't Code § 552.103 and that litigation is "reasonably likely to result").

Based on the information you provided, we find that you have not established that litigation involving the district was pending or reasonably anticipated at the time the district received the instant request for information. Therefore, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.103.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses information that is protected from disclosure by other statutes, including the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 ("FERPA"). *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g. FERPA provides that no federal funds will be made available under any applicable program to an educational agency or institution that releases personally identifiable information (other than directory information) contained in a student's education records to anyone but certain enumerated federal, state, and local officials and institutions, unless otherwise authorized by the student's parent. *See id.* § 1232g(b)(1). "Education records" means those records that contain information directly related to a student and are maintained by an educational agency or institution or by a person acting for such agency or institution. *Id.* § 1232g(a)(4)(A). You also raise section 552.114 of the Government Code for the information for which you raise FERPA. Section 552.114 excepts from disclosure student

---

<sup>2</sup>In 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).

records at an educational institution funded completely or in part by state revenue. This office generally applies the same analysis under section 552.114 and FERPA. Open Records Decision No. 539 (1990).

Section 552.114 excepts from disclosure student records at an educational institution funded completely or in part by state revenue. Section 552.026 provides as follows:

This chapter does not require the release of information contained in education records of an educational agency or institution, except in conformity with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974, Sec. 513, Pub. L. No. 93-380, 20 U.S.C. Sec. 1232g.

In Open Records Decision No. 634 (1995), this office concluded that (1) an educational agency or institution may withhold from public disclosure information that is protected by FERPA and excepted from required public disclosure by sections 552.026 and 552.101 without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision as to those exceptions, and (2) an educational agency or institution that is state-funded may withhold from public disclosure information that is excepted from required public disclosure by section 552.114 as a "student record," insofar as the "student record" is protected by FERPA, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision as to that exception. Information must be withheld from required public disclosure under FERPA only to the extent "reasonable and necessary to avoid personally identifying a particular student." See Open Records Decision Nos. 332 (1982), 206 (1978). We note that FERPA excludes from its statutory definition of education records "records maintained by a law enforcement unit of the educational agency or institution that were created by that law enforcement unit for the purpose of law enforcement." See 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(4)(B)(ii); 34 C.F.R. § 99.8(b)(1); see also 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining "education records" as not including "[r]ecords of the law enforcement unit of an educational agency or institution, subject to the provisions of § 99.8"); Open Records Decision No. 612 (1992) (FERPA and statutory predecessor to section 552.114 not applicable to incident and arrest reports of the state university campus police departments).

Upon review, we conclude that the documents we have marked consist entirely of records maintained by the district that directly relate to a student of the district. Thus, this information constitutes education records for purposes of FERPA. See *e.g.*, *Belanger v. Nashua, New Hampshire School District*, 856 F. Supp. 40, 48-50 (D.N.H. 1994) (broadly construing FERPA definition of "education records"). Further, in this case the request for information reflects that the requestor knows the identity of the student. We therefore find that withholding only the name of this student would not suffice to avoid the release of personally identifiable information contained in student education records as mandated by FERPA. Accordingly, the documents we have marked are generally confidential in their entirety under FERPA.

Juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997 are confidential under section 58.007 of the Family Code. The relevant language of section 58.007(c) reads as follows:

(c) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records and files concerning a child and information stored, by electronic means or otherwise, concerning the child from which a record or file could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult files and records;

(2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as records or files relating to adults, be accessible under controls that are separate and distinct from controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and

(3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subchapter B.

Fam. Code § 58.007(c). Section 51.02(2)(A) of the Family Code defines “child” as a person who is ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age. You state that the “[d]ocuments numbered \*SCUCISD-122\* through \*SCUCISD-267\* consist of law enforcement records belonging to the [district] Police Department pertaining to a . . . student of the [d]istrict who is a juvenile.” We find that these documents involve juvenile conduct that occurred after September 1, 1997. It does not appear that any of the exceptions in section 58.007 apply; therefore, these documents are confidential pursuant to section 58.007(c) of the Family Code and must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

In summary, the marked medical records may only released in accordance with the MPA. The district must withhold the records we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with FERPA and section 58.007 of the Family Code. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.<sup>3</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your remaining claims.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the

---

<sup>3</sup>Some of the documents marked for release contain or consist of confidential information that is not subject to release to the general public. See Gov’t Code § 552.352. However, the requestor in this instance has a special right of access to the information. Gov’t Code § 552.023. Because some of the information is confidential with respect to the general public, if the district receives a future request for this information from an individual other than this requestor or his client, the district should again seek our decision.

governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877)673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512)475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/krl

Ref: ID# 217533

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Bob Comeaux  
Texas Federation of Teachers / AFT  
3000 South IH-35, Suite 240  
Austin, Texas 78704-6536  
(w/o enclosures)