



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

February 27, 2009

Mr. Mike Stafford  
County Attorney  
Harris County Attorney's Office  
1019 Congress, 15th Floor  
Houston, Texas 77002

OR2009-02614

Dear Mr. Stafford:

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# 335965.

The Harris County Risk Management Department and Harris County Constable Precinct 4, collectively (the "county"), each received a request for the dashboard camera video from a named officer's vehicle pertaining to a specified traffic accident. 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.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in 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 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 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). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. See Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Generally, to demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *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.<sup>1</sup> 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).

When the governmental body is the prospective plaintiff in litigation, the evidence of anticipated litigation must at least reflect that litigation involving a specific matter is "realistically contemplated." See ORD No. 518 at 5 (1989); see also Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982) (investigatory file may be withheld if governmental body's attorney determines that it should be withheld pursuant to Gov't Code § 552.103 and that litigation is "reasonably likely to result").

In this instance, you generally state that the county anticipates litigation in this matter. Although you state that the county made a subrogation claim to the requestor pertaining to the accident at issue, you have failed to provide any arguments demonstrating that actual litigation is realistically contemplated by the county. Furthermore, beyond a general statement that the county anticipates litigation in this matter, you have failed to submit any arguments demonstrating that any party has taken objective steps toward filing litigation against the county. Thus, we conclude you have failed to demonstrate that the county reasonably anticipated litigation on the date the present request was received. Accordingly, the county may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

---

<sup>1</sup>In 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).

We note that the submitted video recording contains Texas-issued license plate numbers. Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides that information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title, or registration issued by a Texas agency is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1), (2). Accordingly, the county must withhold these portions of the videotape under section 552.130 of the Government Code. We note, however, that if the county is unable to redact the portions of the submitted videotape that reveal Texas motor vehicle record information, then the tape must be withheld in its entirety pursuant to section 552.130. *See* Open Records Decision No. 364 (1983). As you claim no other exceptions to disclosure, the remaining information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,



Adam Leiber  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ACL/jb

Ref: ID# 335965

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)