



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 19, 2011

Ms. Laura Garza Jimenez
County Attorney
County of Nueces
901 Leopard, Room 207
Corpus Christi, Texas 78401-3680

OR2011-10297

Dear Ms. Jimenez:

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# 424629.

The Nueces County Judge (the "county") received a request for the employment file pertaining to a named individual. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Section 552.103 of the Government Code 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.

Id. § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103 exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that 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.

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.” Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). 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. 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. 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). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. ORD 452 at 4.

You state the county reasonably anticipates litigation because the employee whose personnel file is at issue stated she would hire an attorney and sue the county. You further note the requestor is an attorney for the employee. However, the requestor provides an affidavit of the employee alleging she did not state she would hire an attorney and sue the county. Whether the employee made a statement that she would hire an attorney and sue the county is a question of fact. This office cannot resolve factual disputes in the opinion process. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 592 at 2 (1991), 552 at 4 (1990), 435 at 4 (1986). Where fact issues are not resolvable as a matter of law, we must rely on the facts alleged to us by the governmental body requesting our decision, or on those facts that are discernible from the documents submitted for our inspection. *See* ORD 552 at 4. After review of the submitted information and submitted arguments, we find the county does not provide any concrete evidence showing that the employee or her attorney took any objective steps toward filing suit prior to the county’s receipt of the request. Accordingly, you failed to demonstrate the

county reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Therefore, the county may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.103.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, including section 1324a of title 8 of the United States Code, which provides that an Employment Eligibility Verification Form I-9 “may not be used for purposes other than for enforcement of this chapter” and for enforcement of other federal statutes governing crime and criminal investigations. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1324a(b)(5); *see also* 8 C.F.R. § 274a.2(b)(4). However, after reviewing the submitted information, we find that it does not contain an I-9 form. Accordingly, we conclude that the county may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1324a of title 8 of the United States Code. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, the submitted information must be released in its entirety.¹

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,



Sarah Casterline
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SEC/eb

¹We note the information being released contains confidential information to which the requestor has a right of access. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a). Thus, if the county receives another request for this particular information from a different requestor, then the county should again seek a decision from this office.

Ref: ID# 424629

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)