ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 26, 2013

Ms. Ellen H. Spalding
Counsel for the Eanes Independent School District
Rogers, Morris & Grover, L.L.P.
5718 Westheimer Road, Suite 1200
Houston, Texas 77057

OR2013-20640

Dear Ms. Spalding:

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# 506882 (Eanes Request No. 6776).

The Eanes Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for a receipt and communications pertaining to specific sports equipment. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.[1]

Initially, we note the United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office has informed this office the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code, does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental or an adult student's consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for

[1]We assume that 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act.[2] 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 redacted education records for our review. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing education records, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to the submitted records, except to note the requestor, as a parent, has a right of access under FERPA to her child's education records and her right of access generally prevails over inconsistent provisions of state law. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A) (no funds shall be made available to educational agency that prevents parents of students, who have been in attendance at school, review of student's education records); 34 C.F.R. § 99.3; *see also Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n v. City of Orange, Tex.*, 905 F. Supp. 381, 382 (E.D. Tex. 1995) (holding FERPA prevails over inconsistent provision of state law). Because the educational authority in possession of the education records is now responsible for determining the applicability of FERPA, we will only consider the claimed exception under the Act for the requested information.

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 purpose of section 552.103 is to protect the litigation interests of governmental bodies that are parties to the litigation at issue. *See id.* § 552.103(a); Open Records Decision No. 638 at 2 (1996) (section 552.103 only protects the litigation interests of the governmental body claiming the exception). 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

---

[2]A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf.

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. *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).

To establish 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." 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* 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.[3] *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact 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).

You state, and provide documentation showing, that on the same day the district received the instant request for information, the requestor filed an incident report with the Travis County Sheriff's Office alleging theft by district personnel regarding a particular helmet. You also inform us the requestor stated she will press charges against a named district coach for conversion and against district employees for failing to reimburse the requestor for the particular helmet. You further inform us the requestor, an attorney, has threatened to take the matter to court. Based on your arguments and our review of the information, we determine the district reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the request for information. We also find the information at issue is related to the litigation the district anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information. Therefore, we conclude the district may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

---

[3]In addition, this office has concluded 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).

We note the purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information relating to litigation through discovery procedures. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5. Thus, once information has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated 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). Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends when the litigation has concluded or is no longer reasonably anticipated. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 at 2; Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2.

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,

Thana Hussaini
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TH/som

Ref: ID# 506882

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)