



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 23, 2006

Mr. T. Daniel Santee II
Assistant City Attorney
City of Abilene
P.O. Box 60
Abilene, Texas 79602-0060

OR2006-00723

Dear Mr. Santee:

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# 240678.

The City of Abilene (the "city") received a request for the following categories of information related to the city and the Brazos River Authority (the "authority"):

- (1) System of Operations permit #5851;
- (2) agreements or correspondence since January 1, 2004; and
- (3) the purchase of water since January 1, 2004.

You state that some responsive information has been released to the requestor. You claim that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code, as well as under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5 and Texas Rule of Evidence 503. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in relevant 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 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 of the governmental body's receipt of the request, 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 governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 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. 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).

For purposes of section 552.103(a), this office considers a contested case under the Texas Administrative Procedure Act (the "APA"), chapter 2001 of the Government Code, to constitute "litigation." *See* Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991). You state that the city and the authority filed with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality ("TCEQ") competing permit applications. You further state, and provide documentation showing, that three individuals have since sought a contested case hearing with the TCEQ regarding the proposed permits. Based on your representations and our review, we determine that litigation in this matter, in the form of a contested case under the APA, was reasonably anticipated by the city prior to the date the city received the present request. We further find that the information at issue relates to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). We therefore determine that section 552.103 is applicable to the information in Exhibit C.

We note, however, that 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 the opposing party in the case at issue 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 anticipated. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

We note that section 552.137 of the Government Code is applicable to some of the remaining submitted information. Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). See Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee’s work e-mail address because such an address is not that of the employee as a “member of the public,” but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. Likewise, section 552.137 is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, an Internet website address, or an e-mail address that a governmental entity maintains for one of its officials or employees. We have marked e-mail addresses that do not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Thus, the city must withhold these e-mail addresses under section 552.137 unless their owners have affirmatively consented to their release. See Gov’t Code § 552.137(b).

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the marked e-mail addresses under section 552.137 unless their owners have affirmatively consented to their release. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.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).

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your remaining claims.

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,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/er

Ref: ID# 240678

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Cole Garrett
Henry & Poplin
819½ West 11th Street
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)