



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

May 11, 2011

Mr. Reg Hargrove  
Assistant Attorney General  
Public Information Coordinator  
General Counsel Division  
Office of the Attorney General  
P.O. Box 12548  
Austin, Texas 78711-2548

OR2011-06557

Dear Mr. Hargrove:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 417467 (PIR No. 11-30165).

The Office of the Attorney General (the "OAG") received a request for information concerning Fortune High Tech Marketing ("Fortune"). The OAG released some of the responsive information and seeks to withhold the remaining information from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the OAG's claimed exceptions to disclosure and have reviewed the submitted sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section

---

<sup>1</sup> We assume the representative sample of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested 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.

552.101 encompasses information another statute makes confidential. Section 17.61(f) of the Business and Commerce Code provides:

(f) No documentary material produced pursuant to a demand under this section, unless otherwise ordered by a court for good cause shown, shall be produced for inspection or copying by, nor shall its contents be disclosed to any person other than the authorized employee of the office of the attorney general without the consent of the person who produced the material. The office of the attorney general shall prescribe reasonable terms and conditions allowing the documentary material to be available for inspection and copying by the person who produced the material or any duly authorized representative of that person. . . .

Bus. & Com. Code § 17.61(f). This provision requires the OAG to withhold from required public disclosure all documentary material the OAG obtained pursuant to a Civil Investigative Demand ("CID"). The OAG explains its Consumer Protection and Public Health Division ("CPPHD") issued a CID to Fortune and Fortune complied with the CID by submitting the document so marked by the OAG. Thus, we agree the marked document is information obtained pursuant to a CID, and therefore, is confidential under section 17.61(f). Accordingly, the OAG must withhold said document.

Next, we consider the OAG's section 552.103 assertion for the remaining information. Section 552.103, the litigation exception, 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 OAG has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in this particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the request for information is received, 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 OAG 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). 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* Open Records Decision 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, the OAG states its CPPHD is currently investigating Fortune for potential violations of the Texas Deceptive Trade Practices Act (“DTPA”). The OAG states this investigation antedated the request for information, and it anticipated filing DTPA claims against Fortune when it received the request. After reviewing the OAG’s arguments and the submitted records, we conclude the remaining information relates to the OAG’s anticipated litigation. Thus, the OAG may withhold the remaining information as it has demonstrated the applicability of section 552.103 to the remaining requested information.<sup>2</sup>

Generally, however, 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 anticipated litigation 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 OAG must withhold the information it marked under section 17.61(f) of the Business and Commerce Code and may withhold the remainder under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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

---

<sup>2</sup> Because section 552.103 is dispositive, we do not address the OAG’s sections 552.107 and 552.111 arguments for this information.

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

Sincerely,



Yen-Ha Le  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

YHL/sdk

Ref: ID# 417467

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)