



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 23, 2006

Mr. Nathan C. Barrow
Office of the City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
1000 Throckmorton Street
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2006-02850

Dear Mr. Barrow:

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# 244611.

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for information related to street repairs in the vicinity of a named address and information related to the city's investigative file in response to a claim for damages filed against the city. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

We initially note that some of the submitted information is subject to required public disclosure under section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(3) provides for the disclosure of "information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body[.]" *Id.* § 552.022(a)(3). Section 552.022(a)(5) provides for the disclosure of "all working papers, research material, and information used to estimate the need for or expenditures of public funds or taxes by a governmental body, on completion of the estimate[.]" *Id.* § 552.022(a)(5). Information that is subject to section 552.022 must be released, unless the information is expressly confidential under other law.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See Gov't Code § 552.007; Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive Gov't Code § 552.103); Open Records

Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (discretionary exceptions), 663 (1999)(governmental body may waive section 552.103). As such, section 552.103 is not other law that makes information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information that is subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103. As you raise no other exceptions to disclosure for this information, the information in Exhibit C that we have marked pursuant to section 552.022 of the Government Code must be released.

We now address the exceptions we understand you to claim for Exhibit D. Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” This section encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines work product as:

- (1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or
- (2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party’s representatives or among a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a). A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating that the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party’s representative. TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5; Open Records Decision No. 677 at 6-8 (2002). In order for this office to conclude that the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that 1) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue; and 2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation. *Nat’l Tank Co. v. Brotherton*, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A “substantial chance” of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather “that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear.” *Id.* at 204. Information that meets the work product test is confidential under Rule 192.5 provided the information does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 192.5(c). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information in Exhibit D, we find that the city anticipated litigation and that this information reveals the attorney’s thought processes regarding the anticipated litigation. Thus, the submitted information in

Exhibit D may be withheld under section 552.111 as attorney work product. As our ruling on the information in Exhibit D is dispositive, we do not address your other claimed exceptions for this information.

We now address the remaining documents in Exhibit C that are not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. You claim that the information in Exhibit C is subject to section 552.103 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 provides in relevant part 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 on the date that the city received the request for information, 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 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). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Id.* In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated that a governmental body has met its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter and the governmental body represents that the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act ("TTCA"), Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code, ch. 101, or an applicable municipal ordinance.

You state that the city received a Notice of Claim in compliance with the TTCA, which alleges property damage on the part of the city with respect to the claimants. You inform us

that the city received the Notice of Claim prior to receiving the present request for information. Therefore, we conclude that the city reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the present request for information. We further find that the information at issue relates to the anticipated litigation. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information in Exhibit C that is not subject to section 552.022 pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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 pending lawsuit 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. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, the information we have marked in Exhibit C that is subject to section 552.022 must be released. The city may withhold the information in Exhibit C that is not subject to section 552.022 pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code. The submitted information in Exhibit D may be withheld under section 552.111 as attorney work product.

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, 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,



James Forrest
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JF/er

Ref: ID# 244611

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Edward R. Nelson, III
Friedman, Suder & Cooke
604 East Forth Street, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
(w/o enclosures)