



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 3, 2003

Mr. R. Neel McDonald
Assistant City Attorney
Freestone County
118 East Commerce, Room 305
Fairfield, Texas 75840

OR2003-6187

Dear Mr. McDonald:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 187041.

The County of Freestone (the "County") received a request for a specific offense report. You argue that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

The County argues the information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code as interpreted by *Holmes v. Morales*. See *Holmes v. Morales*, 924 S.W.2d 920 (Tex. 1996). In *Holmes*, the Texas Supreme Court held that the plain language of section 552.108 did not require a governmental body to show that release of the information would unduly interfere with law enforcement. *Holmes*, 924 S.W.2d at 925. This is no longer the case. Subsequent to the interpretation of section 552.108 in *Holmes*, the Seventy-fifth Legislature amended section 552.108 extensively. See Act of June 1, 1997, 75th Leg., R.S., ch. 1231, § 1, 1997 Tex. Gen. Laws 4697. As amended, section 552.108 now expressly requires a governmental body to explain, among other things, how release of the information would interfere with law enforcement. The exception now reads as follows:

- (a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

- (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime;
- (2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication; or
- (3) it is information that:
 - (A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or
 - (B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

Gov't Code § 552.108. Thus, under the current law, a governmental body claiming section 552.108 must provide an explanation as to how and why section 552.108 applies to the requested information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108, 552.301; *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977); Open Records Decision No. 434 (1986). In raising section 552.108, you state only that the requested information is "related to litigation of a criminal nature to which the State is a party." Such a general assertion is not sufficient; you must specifically demonstrate that one of the subdivisions of section 552.108 is applicable. You do not explain how release of this information would interfere with the detection, investigation or prosecution of crime, or whether the investigation concluded in a result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1), (2). Because the County failed to show the applicability of section 552.108, it may not withhold the information under section 552.108.

Next, you claim that section 552.103 of the Government Code excepts the offense report from public disclosure. This exception provides in 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). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of section 552.103 to the information that it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate: (1) that litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information *and* (2) that the information at issue is related to that litigation. See *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); see also Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *Id.*

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 that 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.” *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”). The only explanation you give is that the information “is related to litigation of a criminal nature to which the State is a party.” Therefore, after carefully reviewing your arguments and the submitted information, we find that the County has failed to present us with concrete evidence that litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date it received the request and failed to explain how the information at issue relates to the litigation. Because the County has not met its burden, we conclude that the information may not be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

In summary, because the County failed to demonstrate the applicability of either section 552.108 or section 552.103 to the requested information, the County must release the information.

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,



Heather R. Rutland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

HRR/sdk

Ref: ID# 187041

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. James V. Fulcher
c/o R. Neel McDonald
Freestone County
118 East Commerce, Room 305
Fairfield, Texas 75840
(w/o enclosures)