



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 12, 2011

Mr. Randy A. Stonerod
Deputy City Attorney
City of Temple
2 North Main Street, Suite 308
Temple, Texas 76501

OR2011-06616

Dear Mr. Stonerod:

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# 417342.

The City of Temple (the "city") received two identical requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to a specified accident. You state you have released some of the requested information. You claim the submitted 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.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he 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 a completed report and investigation that are expressly public under section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release this information, which we have marked, pursuant to section 552.022 unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is expressly made confidential under other law. *See id.* You claim this information is subject to section 552.103 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects the governmental body's interests and is therefore not "other law" that makes information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a). *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Consequently, the city may not withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under section 552.103 of the Government Code. As you raise no other exceptions against the disclosure of this information, it must be released.

We now address your argument under section 552.103 of the Government Code for the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(1). Section 552.103 provides, in relevant part:

(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 claiming section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of section 552.103 to the information it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate: (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).

To establish 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." *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim 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"). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, or when an individual threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 346 (1982), 288 (1981). 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). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983). *Cf.* Open Records Decision Nos. 638 at 3 (mere fact that individual alleged damages does not serve to establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated), 551 at 1 (litigation reasonably anticipated when attorney's letter demanded damages and stated that attorney was authorized to file suit if damages were not paid).

You state, and provide documentation showing, prior to the city's receipt of the instant request, four individuals hired the requestor's law firm to file a claim against the city pertaining to the specified accident. You state the claim is currently pending against the city. We note the submitted documents reveal a claim is pending that was filed against the city seeking reimbursement for property damage and personal injuries. Based on your representations and our review, we agree litigation was reasonably anticipated on the date the city received the present request for information. You also state the information at issue pertains to the substance of the claims. Based on your representation and our review, we find the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation. Therefore, we conclude the city may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(1) under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to all parties to 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 been concluded or is no longer anticipated. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, the city must release the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1), which we have marked. The city may withhold the remaining information 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 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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/bs

Ref: ID# 417342

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)