



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 14, 2007

Mr. Thomas Bailey
Legal Services
VIA Metropolitan Transit
P.O. Box 12489
San Antonio, Texas 78212

OR2007-14956

Dear Mr. Bailey:

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# 295074.

VIA Metropolitan Transit ("VIA") received a request for 17 categories of information related to a specified incident. 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 representative sample of information.

Initially, we note that VIA submitted a representative sample of information responsive to categories 1 through 8, but did not submit any information responsive to categories 9 through 17. We assume that the "representative sample" of information responsive to categories 1 through 8 submitted to this office is truly representative of these types of responsive records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office. Accordingly, we assume that, to the extent any information responsive to categories 9 through 17 existed on the date VIA received this request, you have released it to the requestor. If you have not released any such information, you must release it at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Next, we note that the submitted information includes documents that are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides, in relevant part:

(a) the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information contains two completed incident reports made for or by VIA, which are expressly public under section 552.022(a)(1). Although you claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code, we note that this exception to disclosure is a discretionary exception under the Act that does not constitute "other law" for purposes of section 552.022.¹ Thus, VIA may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022, which we have marked, under section 552.103 of the Government Code. As you raise no further exceptions against the disclosure of this information, it must be released.

We address your claim under section 552.103 of the Government Code for the remaining information. 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

¹Discretionary exceptions are intended to protect only the interests of the governmental body, as distinct from exceptions which are intended to protect information deemed confidential by law or which implicates the interests of third parties. See *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 section 552.103); Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Discretionary exceptions, therefore, do not constitute "other law" that makes information confidential.

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). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103 exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the governmental body 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). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103.

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. *See 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

In this instance, you inform us that the requestor is an attorney representing the family and estate of the deceased individual involved in the specified incident. You state, and provide documentation showing, that VIA received previous correspondence from the requestor, in which he states: “In the event that we do not hear from [VIA] we will initiate litigation” and “[i]t appears that VIA has no interest in resolving this matter promptly. We will prepare this matter for litigation.” Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude that VIA reasonably anticipated litigation on the date that it received this request for information. Furthermore, upon review of the remaining information and your representations, we find that the information relates to the anticipated litigation. Accordingly, we conclude that section 552.103 is generally applicable to the remaining submitted information and it may be withheld on that basis.

However, once the information at issue has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to the information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, any

submitted 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 must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has concluded or is no longer anticipated. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

To conclude, VIA must release the two completed incident reports that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The remaining submitted information may be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Jordan Johnson". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Jordan Johnson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JJ/jb

Ref: ID# 295074

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Paul E. Campolo, Esq.
Maloney & Campolo, L.L.P.
900 South East Military Drive
San Antonio, Texas 78214
(w/o enclosures)