



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 31, 2005

Ms. Susan C. Rocha
Mr. Alan T. Ozuna
Denton, Navarro, Rocha and Bernal, P.C.
2517 North Main Avenue
San Antonio, Texas 78212

OR2005-00874

Dear Ms. Rocha and Mr. Ozuna:

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# 217796.

The City of New Braunfels (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests for records regarding interviews of city employees related to the termination of some city employees. You claim that the requested 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. We have also considered comments submitted by other interested parties. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing for submission of comments regarding why requested information should or should not be withheld).

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 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 city 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. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. 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 city must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). 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). 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).

Having reviewed the submitted documentation and your arguments, we conclude, based on the totality of the circumstances, that litigation was reasonably anticipated on the date the city received this request for information. In addition, we find that the requested information is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). Thus, the city may generally withhold the information from disclosure under section 552.103.

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).

However, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to all other parties in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded or is no longer reasonably anticipated. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

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,



L. Joseph James
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LJJ/seg

Ref: ID# 217796

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Ron Maloney
Herald-Zeitung
707 Landa Street
New Braunfels, Texas 78130
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Atanacio Campos
Attorney at Law
P.O. Box 310859
New Braunfels, Texas 78131-0859
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Orlando Cardenas
P.O. Box 522
Marion, Texas 78124
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Santiago Lagunas, Jr.
3350 Morningside Drive
New Braunfels, Texas 78132
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Carlos Perez
2257 West Mill Street
New Braunfels, Texas 78130
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Saul E. Ibarra, Jr.
863 West Merriweather
New Braunfels, Texas 78130
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Adrian H. Juarez
444 East Camp
New Braunfels, Texas 78130
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Armando Padron
1258 West San Antonio
New Braunfels, Texas 78130
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Fernando Gomez
448 Leisure Village Drive, Lot #14
New Braunfels, Texas 78130
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Javier Nieto
2456 Savannah Hill Circle
New Braunfels, Texas 78130
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jerry L. Romines
5635 IH-35 North
New Braunfels, Texas 78130
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mike Massey
1667 Anna Lee
New Braunfels, Texas 78130
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bernardo Gutierrez, Jr.
c/o Mr. Atanacio Campos
Attorney at Law
P.O. Box 310859
New Braunfels, Texas 78131-0859
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Roland Martinez
c/o Mr. Glen Peterson
Attorney at Law
321 Weiss Road
New Braunfels, Texas 78130
(w/o enclosures)