



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

April 11, 2011

Ms. Judith N. Benton
Assistant City Attorney
City of Waco
P.O. Box 2570
Waco, Texas 76702-2570

OR2011-04911

Dear Ms. Benton:

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# 414905 (ORR# LGL-11-0130).

The Waco Police Department (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to offense report number 10-025288. You claim 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 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). 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.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 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).

For purposes of section 552.103(a), litigation includes civil lawsuits and criminal prosecutions, as well as proceedings that are governed by the Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 2001 of the Government Code, or are otherwise conducted in a quasi-judicial forum. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 588 (1991), 474 (1987), 368 (1983), 336 (1982). In determining whether an administrative proceeding is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum, this office has considered the following factors: 1) whether the dispute is, for all practical purposes, litigated in an administrative proceeding where a) discovery takes place, b) evidence is heard, c) factual questions are resolved, and d) a record is made; and 2) whether the proceeding is an adjudicative forum of first jurisdiction, *i.e.*, whether judicial

¹In addition, this office has concluded 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).

review of the proceeding in district court is an appellate review and not the forum for resolving a controversy on the basis of evidence. *See* ORD 588.

You inform us the requested police report relates to the City of Waco (the "city") suspending the dance hall permit of an establishment. You state the permit holder has appealed the suspension and, thus, argue "based on the totality of circumstances and since the administrative process has not been completed that litigation is anticipated." You have not informed us, however, that the requestor has actually threatened litigation or otherwise taken any concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation. *See* ORD 331. Further, you have provided no explanation as to how the city's administrative process relating to the suspension of the permit constitutes litigation of a judicial or quasi-judicial nature for purposes of section 552.103. *See generally* Open Records Decision No. 301 (1982) (discussing meaning of "litigation" under predecessor to section 552.103). Consequently, you have not established that the department reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note you have highlighted portions of the submitted information that related to 9-1-1 callers. Section 552.101 of Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision."² Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information made confidential by statute. Chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code authorizes the development of local emergency communication districts. Sections 772.118, 772.218, and 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code are applicable to emergency 9-1-1 districts established in accordance with chapter 772. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996). These sections make the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers furnished by a service supplier confidential. *Id.* at 2. Section 772.118 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than two million. Section 772.218 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 860,000. Section 772.318 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 20,000.

We understand that the department is part of an emergency communication district established under section 772.318. As noted above, you have highlighted the telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers. Provided that this information was furnished by a 9-1-1 service supplier, the department must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code.

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 at 2 (1987), 480 at 5 (1987); *see, e.g.*, Open Records Decision No. 470 at 2 (1987) (because release of confidential information could impair rights of third parties and because improper release constitutes a misdemeanor, attorney general will raise predecessor statute of section 552.101 on behalf of governmental bodies).

However, if this information was not provided by a 9-1-1 service supplier to the emergency communication district, then the department may not withhold this information under section 552.101 on that ground. The department must release the remaining information to the requestor.³

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, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/tf

Ref: ID# 414905

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

³We note the requestor has a right of access to information in the submitted documents that otherwise would be excepted from release under the Act. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) ("a person or a person's authorized representative has a special right of access, beyond the right of the general public, to information held by a governmental body that relates to the person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests."); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning herself). Thus, the department must again seek a decision from this office if it receives a request for this information from a different requestor.