



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 31, 2009

Mr. Jason Jares
City Prosecutor
City of San Angelo
P.O. Box 1751
San Angelo, Texas 76902-1751

OR2009-04181

Dear Mr. Jares:

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# 339308.

The City of San Angelo Police Department (the "department") received a request for information related to a specified accident involving two named individuals. 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 Governmental Code 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). A governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code 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 district must satisfy both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

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). To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue 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.¹ 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).

In this instance, you generally assert that litigation is reasonably anticipated because the requestor is a law firm hired to represent the family of the deceased in a potential wrongful death lawsuit. However, you have failed to submit any additional arguments showing that any party has taken objective steps towards actually filing litigation against the department. As stated above, the mere possibility of litigation without objective steps toward filing suit, is not sufficient to show that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* ORD 361. Thus, we conclude that you have failed to demonstrate that the department reasonably anticipated

¹Among 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).

litigation when it received the request for information. Accordingly, the requested information may not be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note, however, that the submitted documents contain information subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code.² Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit or a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1)-(2). The department must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130. The department must also withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information contained in the submitted videos pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code. If the department lacks the technical capability to redact the information subject to section 552.130 in the submitted videos, the department must withhold the videos in their entirety.

In summary, the department must withhold the marked Texas-issued motor vehicle record information under section 552.130 of the Government Code. As you raise no further arguments against disclosure, the remaining information must be released.

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, 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,



Tamara Wilcox
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TW/eeg

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Ref: ID# 339308

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)