



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 29, 2005

Mr. Hugh Coleman
Assistant District Attorney
Denton County Criminal Attorney's Office
127 N. Woodrow Lane
Denton, Texas 76250

OR2005-08847

Dear Mr. Coleman:

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# 233286.

The Denton County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office") received two requests for the incident report of May 12, 2005 and all other records from March 10, 2005 through June 9, 2005 regarding the requestor. You claim that the requests are subject to section 552.028 of the Government Code. You also claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered your claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we address your argument under section 552.028 of the Government Code. This section provides:

(a) A governmental body is not required to accept or comply with a request for information from:

(1) an individual who is imprisoned or confined in a correctional facility; or

(2) an agent of that individual, other than that individual's attorney when the attorney is requesting information that is subject to disclosure under this chapter.

(b) This section does not prohibit a governmental body from disclosing to an individual described by Subsection (a)(1), or that individual's agent, information held by the governmental body pertaining to that individual.

Gov't Code § 552.028. Thus, under section 552.028, a governmental body has discretion to release requested public information to an incarcerated individual or to an incarcerated individual's agent. *See Hickman v. Moya*, 976 S.W.2d 360 (Tex. App.—Waco, 1998). Since you state that the requestor was not incarcerated at the time of the requests, we find that section 552.028 is not applicable in this instance. Therefore, we will address your argument against disclosure.

You claim that the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.103 of the Governmental Code. This section 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 sheriff's office 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 on the date the governmental body received the request, 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 sheriff's office 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). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Id.* Among other examples, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated where the opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: (1) filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); (2) 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 (3) threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

In this instance, you do not claim that a lawsuit was filed against the sheriff's office at the time the requests were received. Instead, you state that it is a reasonable assumption that litigation is anticipated when a former inmate requests incident reports. However, you have not provided any concrete evidence nor otherwise demonstrated that your claim of anticipated litigation is more than mere conjecture. Accordingly, we conclude that the sheriff's office may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. As you do not claim any other exceptions against disclosure, the submitted information must be released.¹

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).

¹We note, however, that the submitted documents contain information that is confidential with respect to the general public. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023 (person's authorized representative has special right of access to information that is excepted from public disclosure under laws intended to protect person's privacy interest as subject of the information); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when person asks governmental body for information concerning the person himself or herself). Thus, in the event the district attorney receives another request for this information from someone other than this requestor or her representative, the district attorney must ask this office for a decision whether the information is subject to public disclosure.


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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Jaclyn N. Thompson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JNT/krl

Ref: ID# 233286

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Angela McPike
704 Furman
Allen, Texas 75013
(w/o enclosures)