



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

August 29, 2006

Mr. J. Erik Nichols  
Henslee Fowler Hepworth & Schwartz  
3200 S. W. Freeway, Suite 1200  
Houston, Texas 77027

OR2006-09996

Dear Mr. Nichols:

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# 258049.

The Dickinson Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for the interview statements of each student interviewed in a district investigation of allegations of discrimination in a district baseball program. You state you have released some of the submitted information to the requestor, but you claim that the remaining submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.026, 552.101, 552.114, and 552.135 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that recently, the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") informed this office that the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. §1232g, does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Public Information Act (the "Act"). 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, among other things, unredacted 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. Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, we also do not address your arguments under sections 552.026 or 552.114 of the Government Code. See Gov't Code §§ 552.026 (incorporating FERPA into the Act); .114 (excepting from disclosure "student records"); Open Records Decision No. 539 (1990) (determining the same analysis applies under section 552.114 of the Government Code and FERPA). We will, however, address the applicability of the remaining claimed exceptions to the submitted information.

You claim that the remaining submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer's privilege. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. The common-law informer's privilege, incorporated into the Act by section 552.101, has long been recognized by Texas courts. See *Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided that the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1-2 (1978). The privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." Open Records Decision No. 279 at 2 (1981) (citing Wigmore, Evidence, § 2374, at 767 (McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. See Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4-5 (1988). The informer's privilege does not, however, apply to information that does not describe alleged illegal conduct. Open Records Decision No. 515 at 5. In addition, the privilege excepts the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990).

In this instance, we find the submitted information does not identify persons who reported the alleged illegal conduct at issue, or, the identified persons did not report illegal conduct. Thus, the submitted information is not protected by the informer's privilege and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

You also claim that the remaining submitted information is excepted under section 552.135 of the Government Code. Section 552.135 provides in relevant part:

---

<sup>1</sup>In the future, if the district does obtain parental consent to submit unredacted education records and the district seeks a ruling from this office on the proper redaction of those education records in compliance with FERPA, we will rule accordingly.

(a) "Informer" means a student or 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].

Gov't Code § 552.135(a)-(b). Section 552.135 protects an informer's identity, but does not encompass protection for witness statements. Upon review, we find that you have failed to demonstrate that the submitted information identifies an informer for purposes of section 552.135. Thus, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.135.

In summary, the submitted information is not excepted from disclosure under the Act. However, this ruling does not address the applicability of FERPA to the submitted information. Should the district determine that all or portions of the submitted information consists of "education records" that must be withheld under FERPA, the district must dispose of that information in accordance with FERPA, rather than the Act. Any remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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 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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Ramsey A. Abarca  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RAA/eb

Ref: ID# 258049

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Ruben Rodriguez  
4606 39<sup>th</sup> Street East  
Dickinson, Texas 77539  
(w/o enclosures)