



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL
GREG ABBOTT

May 5, 2003

Mr. James R. Raup
McGinnis, Lochridge & Kilgore, L.L.P.
919 Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2003-2988

Dear Mr. Raup:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 180469.

The Eanes Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received four requests for information relating to complaints by and against named employees. You state that you released all of the requested information with the exception of a single document, which you claim is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.103 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 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.

The district has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that 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, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal*

Found., 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *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 district must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 552.103(a). To demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the district must furnish concrete evidence that litigation is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989). 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.¹ 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).

You state that the submitted information relates to grievances filed against district employees. You have not established, however, that the district's grievance proceedings should be considered litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991) (stating that contested case under Administrative Procedure Act is litigation for purposes of predecessor to section 552.103(a)). Furthermore, while you state that one of the grievants is represented by counsel, you have not established that this individual has otherwise taken concrete steps toward litigation. Accordingly, you have not demonstrated that litigation is reasonably anticipated in this matter. *See generally* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986) (whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on case-by-case basis). Thus, the district may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103.

We note, however, that a portion of the submitted information is subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code. This section excepts from disclosure the home addresses, home telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, pursuant to section 552.117(1), the district must withhold the above-listed information for all current or former officials or employees who elected, prior to the district's receipt of this request, to keep such information confidential. The district may not withhold such information under section 552.117 for anyone who did not make a timely election. We have marked the information that must be withheld if a timely election was made.

¹In addition, this office has concluded that 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).

In summary, the district must withhold the information we have marked as being subject to section 552.117 if the employee at issue elected, prior to the district's receipt of this request, to keep such information confidential. All other information must be released.

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, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, 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 Texas Building and Procurement Commission 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. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code

§ 552.325. 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,



Denis C. McElroy
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DCM/lmt

Ref: ID# 180469

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Kathy Blackwell
Austin American-Statesman
P.O. Box 670
Austin, Texas 78767
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Jo Layne Boies
2315 Town Lake Circle # 302
Austin, Texas 78741
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dane Anderson
Westlake Picayune
3103 Bee Cave Road, Suite 102
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bob Jocius
Eanes Independent School District
601 Camp Craft Road
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)