



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 1, 2015

Mr. Christopher B. Gilbert  
Counsel for Angleton Independent School District  
Thompson & Horton, L.L.P.  
3200 Southwest Freeway, Suite 2000  
Houston, Texas 77027

OR2015-13220

Dear Mr. Gilbert:

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# 569527.

The Angleton Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for all education records, police reports, and e-mails to or from the district's police department (the "department") pertaining to a named former student and a specified incident. You indicate you will provide some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup> We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note the district has submitted redacted and unredacted education records for our review. The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office has

---

<sup>1</sup>We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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 consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act.<sup>2</sup> 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”). However, FERPA is not applicable to law enforcement records maintained by the district that were created by the department for a law enforcement purpose. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(a)(4)(B)(ii); 34 C.F.R. §§ 99.3, 99.8.

The submitted information includes law enforcement records relating to a criminal investigation by the department. Thus, this information is not subject to FERPA, and no portion of this record may be withheld on that basis. Because we are able to discern the nature of the redacted information, we are not prevented from determining whether that information falls within the scope of the district’s claimed exceptions to disclosure. Accordingly, we will address the district’s arguments with respect to the information at issue, including the redacted information. Nevertheless, we caution the district that a failure to provide this office with requested information generally deprives us of the ability to determine whether information may be withheld and leaves this office with no alternative other than ordering the redacted information to be released. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body must provide this office with copy of specific information requested or representative sample if information is voluminous). The remaining information does not constitute law enforcement records. 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 remaining information, except to note the requestor has a right of access under FERPA to her client’s education records and her right of access prevails over a claim under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.108 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 Gov’t Code § 552.103); *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). Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. Nevertheless, we will address the applicability of the claimed exceptions to the remaining information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t

---

<sup>2</sup>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/20060725usdoae.pdf>.

Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act] and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

...

(k) Notwithstanding Subsection (a), an investigating agency, other than the [Texas Department of Family and Protective Services] or the Texas Youth Commission, on request, shall provide to the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child who is the subject of reported abuse or neglect, or to the child if the child is at least 18 years of age, information concerning the reported abuse or neglect that would otherwise be confidential under this section. The investigating agency shall withhold information under this subsection if the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of the child requesting the information is alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect.

(l) Before a child or a parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child may inspect or copy a record or file concerning the child under Subsection (k), the custodian of the record or file must redact:

...

(2) any information that is excepted from required disclosure under [the Act], or other law.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a), (k), (l)(2). We note the district is not an agency authorized to conduct an investigation under chapter 261 of the Family Code. *See id.* § 261.103 (listing agencies that may conduct child abuse investigations). However, upon review, we find Exhibits A and B were used or developed by the department in investigations of alleged or suspected child abuse under chapter 261 of the Family Code. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining

“child” for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes), 261.001(1)(defining “abuse” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). Accordingly, we find the information at issue is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. However, we note the requestor is the attorney for the child victim named in the information at issue. Therefore, the district may not withhold the information at issue from the requestor under section 261.201(a). *See id.* § 261.201(k). We also note section 261.201(1)(2) states that any information excepted from required disclosure under the Act or other law may still be withheld from disclosure. *See id.* § 261.201(1)(2). Thus, we will address whether any portion of the submitted information must be withheld under the Act or other law.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 58.007 of the Family Code. Juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997, are confidential under section 58.007. *Id.* § 58.007(c). The relevant language of section 58.007 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 Subchapters B, D, and E.

*Id.* For purposes of section 58.007(c), “child” means a person who is ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age at the time of the reported conduct. *See id.* § 51.02(2). Portions of the submitted information involve juvenile delinquent conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997. *See id.* § 51.03 (defining “delinquent conduct” for purposes of Fam. Code § 58.007). Thus, this information is subject to section 58.007(c). In this instance, it does not appear any of the exceptions to confidentiality under section 58.007 apply. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked under

section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code.<sup>3</sup>

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). You state the remaining information in Exhibit B pertains to a concluded criminal investigation by the department that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on your representation and our review, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the information at issue.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure “basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.” *Id.* § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). *See also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Accordingly, with the exception of basic information, the district may withhold the remaining information in Exhibit B under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup>

Section 552.103 of the Government Code 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

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information, except to note basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle* is generally not excepted from public disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Open Records Decision No. 597 (1991).

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 the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (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). See ORD 551.

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 establish 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.<sup>5</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. 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 district reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information because the requestor "is an attorney who specializes in civil rights and Title IX litigation." However, upon review, we find you have 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

---

<sup>5</sup>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).

when it received the request for information. Therefore, the district may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.

In summary, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code. With the exception of basic information, the district may withhold the remaining information in Exhibit B under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information.<sup>6</sup>

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](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,



Kenny Moreland  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KJM/som

Ref: ID# 569527

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>6</sup>We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released pursuant to section 261.201(k) of the Family Code. Accordingly, if the district receives another request for this information from a different requestor, then the district should again seek a decision from this office.