



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 8, 2014

Ms. Kelly H. Karczewski
Counsel for the Shelbyville Independent School District
Karczewski Bradshaw, L.L.P.
315 North Church
Nacogdoches, Texas 75961

OR2014-13812

Dear Ms. Karczewski:

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# 532120.

Shelbyville Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to the district's investigation of a specified incident. 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 information.

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 the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act.¹ 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

¹A 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>.

disclosed. *See* 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining “personally identifiable information”). You have submitted 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, other than to note parents and their legal representatives have a right of access to their child’s education records and their right of access prevails over a claim under section 552.103 of the Government Code. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(1)(A); 34 C.F.R. § 99.3; Open Records Decision No. 431 (1985) (information subject to right of access under FERPA may not be withheld pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.103); *see also Equal Employment Opportunity Comm’n v. City of Orange, Tex.*, 905 F. Supp. 381, 382 (E.D. Tex. 1995) (FERPA prevails over inconsistent provision of state law). Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records.² However, we will consider the district’s claimed exceptions to the extent the student’s parent or the parent’s legal representative do not have a right of access to the submitted information under FERPA.

Next, we note a portion of the submitted information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant requests for information because it was created after the district received the requests. This ruling does not address the public availability of information not responsive to the present requests, and the district need not release non-responsive information in response to these requests.

Next, we must address the district’s obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedural obligations that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Section 552.301(b) requires that a governmental body ask for a decision from this office and state which exceptions apply to the requested information by the tenth business day after receiving the request. Gov’t Code § 552.301(b). You state the district received the first request for information on May 20, 2014. We note May 26, 2014, was a holiday. This office does not count the date the request was received or holidays as business days for the purpose of calculating a governmental body’s deadlines under the Act. Accordingly, you were required to provide the information required by section 552.301(b) by June 4, 2014. However, you did not raise section 552.103 of the Government Code until June 11, 2014. Accordingly, with respect to the first request, we find the district failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by subsection 552.301(b) as to its claim under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Generally, if a governmental body fails to timely raise an exception, that exception is waived. *See generally id.* § 552.302; Open Records Decision No. 663 at 5 (1999) (untimely request

²In the future, if the district does obtain parental or an adult student’s 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.

for decision resulted in waiver of discretionary exceptions). Section 552.103 of the Government Code is discretionary and may be waived. *See 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 No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, in failing to timely raise section 552.103 for the information responsive to the first request, the district has waived it and may not withhold any of the information responsive to the first request on that basis. As you raise no other exceptions to disclosure of the information responsive to the first request, the district must release it. Additionally, we note in waiving section 552.103 for the information responsive to the first request, the district has also waived its claim under section 552.103 with respect to the same information responsive to the second request for information. *See Gov't Code § 552.007* (prohibiting selective disclosure of information); Open Records Decision No. 463 at 1-2 (1987). Accordingly, we have marked for release that information contained in the information responsive to the second request. However, we will consider the district's timely-raised arguments under section 552.103 for the remaining information responsive to the second request.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(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) applies 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 requested information 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 at 4.

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *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. 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).

You state the requestor filed a grievance with the district on behalf on his client. You contend, and the submitted information contains a letter from the requestor showing, the requestor is only filing the grievance as a prerequisite to filing suit against the district. Further, you inform us the requestor sent this letter to the district prior to the district's receipt of the second request for information. Based on your arguments and our review of the information at issue, we find the district reasonably anticipated litigation on the date this request was received. You also state the information at issue pertains to the substance of the anticipated litigation. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation. Therefore, the district may generally withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note, however, the opposing party has seen or had access to some of the information at issue. The purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties seeking information relating to that litigation to obtain it through discovery procedures. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5. Thus, once the opposing party has seen or had access to information relating to the anticipated litigation through discovery or otherwise, there is no interest in withholding such information from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Upon review, we find the information we have marked was seen by the opposing party to the anticipated litigation and may not be withheld under section 552.103. As you raise no other exceptions to disclosure of this information, the information we have marked must be released. However, the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We also note 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 district must release the information responsive to the first request for information pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code.³ Except for the information we have marked for release, the district 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 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,



Lee Seidlits
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CLS/som

Ref: ID# 532120

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

³We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates, or that party's representative, solely on grounds that information is considered confidential by privacy principles).