



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 27, 2012

Mr. Michael D. Siemer
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283

OR2012-19041

Dear Mr. Siemer:

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# 472238 (COSA File No. W10080).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for seven categories of information pertaining to a specified incident involving the requestor's client. 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 a portion of the submitted information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant request because it was created after the request was received by the city. This ruling does not address the public availability of the information that is not responsive to the request, and the city is not required to release this information in response to this request.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides:

(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). 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). This office has also concluded a governmental body's receipt of a claim letter that it represents to be in compliance with the notice requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act ("TTCA"), chapter 101 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code, or an applicable municipal ordinance, is sufficient to establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. See Open Records Decision No. 638 at 4 (1996). If that representation is not made, the receipt of a claim letter is a factor we will consider in determining, from the totality of the circumstances presented, whether the governmental body has established that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *Id.*

You state, prior to the date the city received the instant request, the city received a letter from an attorney which notified the city of a claim for personal injuries and damages and cited the

¹In addition, this office has concluded that 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. See Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982).

TTCA. However, we note you do not affirmatively represent to this office the notice of claim complies with the TTCA or an applicable ordinance; therefore, we will only consider the claim as a factor in determining whether the city reasonably anticipated litigation over the incident in question. You inform us the attorney also requested preservation of certain documents related to the incident and threatened "adverse judicial actions" if such documents were not preserved. You also state, prior to the date of the request, the city received a second letter from an attorney for the claimant which states the purpose of the correspondence is to encourage a resolution of the claim without further legal action and threatens a lawsuit will be filed. Therefore, based on your representations, our review of the responsive information, and the totality of the circumstances, we determine the city has established it reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the request for information. We also find the responsive information is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Accordingly, the city may withhold the responsive information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note, however, once the information at issue has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to the information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, any information obtained from or provided to all other parties in 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 concluded or is no longer reasonably anticipated. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

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,



Michelle R. Garza
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MRG/som

Ref: ID# 472238

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)