



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 23, 2015

Mr. Mark Neal
Associate Superintendent
Abilene Independent School District
P.O. Box 981
Abilene, Texas 79604

OR2015-07809

Dear Mr. Neal:

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# 560886.

The Abilene Independent School District (the "district") received a request for all e-mails sent between two named individuals during a specified time period. You state the district will redact information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), 20 U.S.C. § 1232g.¹ 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). You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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 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. The DOE has determined FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the educational records. We have posted a copy of the letter from the DOE on the Attorney General's website at <http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/20060725usdoe.pdf>.

²We note although you raise section 552.305 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure, this section is not an exception to public disclosure under the Act. See Gov't Code §§ 552.024, .301, .305.

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 governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show 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. *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). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a).

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 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, an attorney for a potential opposing party making a demand for payment and asserting an intent to sue if such payments are not made. Open Records Decision Nos. 555 at 3 (1990), 346 (1982). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision No. 288 at 2 (1981). However, an individual publicly threatening to bring suit against a governmental body, but who does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, is not concrete evidence that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 at 1-2 (1982).

You state the submitted information pertains to a civil or criminal matter. You explain the information at issue involves a criminal case against a named employee, and impending

litigation involving another named employee who was separated from employment with the district. You further explain there “have been widely publicized suggestions by the local police chief” that certain district employees impeded police investigations and “responsive assertions by school personnel that they had been mischaracterized and defamed[.]” However, we note the district is not a party to the pending criminal litigation. Therefore, the district does not have a litigation interest in the matter for purposes of section 552.103. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.103(a); Open Records Decision No. 575 at 2 (1990) (stating that predecessor to section 552.103 only applies when governmental body is party to litigation). In such a situation, we require an affirmative representation from the governmental body with the litigation interest that the governmental body wants the information at issue withheld from disclosure under section 552.103(a). However, the district has not provided this office with an affirmative representation from a governmental body with a litigation interest explaining that it seeks to withhold the information at issue pursuant to section 552.103(a). Further, we find the district has not demonstrated any party had taken concrete steps toward filing litigation when the district received the request for information. Thus, we conclude the district has failed to demonstrate it reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). Therefore, the district may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code. As no further exceptions to disclosure are raised, the district must release the submitted information.

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,



Lauren Dahlstein
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LMD/som

Ref: ID# 560886

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)