



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 27, 2014

Mr. Christopher Garza
Assistant District Attorney
Brazoria County District Attorney's Office
111 East Locust, Suite 408A
Angleton, Texas 77515

OR2014-03580

Dear Mr. Garza:

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# 515239.

The Brazoria County District Attorney's Office, the Brazoria County Sheriff's Office, and the Brazoria County Purchasing Department (collectively, the "county") received a request for thirteen categories of information pertaining to policies and procedures of the Brazoria County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office"), the requestor's client's arrest, the officers who arrested the requestor's client, and citizen complaints.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the

¹We note the county sought and received clarification from the requestor regarding the request. See Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); see also *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

We understand you to assert some of the submitted information constitutes records of the judiciary. The Act applies only to information that is "written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business by a governmental body." Gov't Code § 552.002(a)(1). However, the Act's definition of "governmental body" "does not include the judiciary." *See id.* § 552.003(1)(B). Information that is "collected, assembled or maintained by or for the judiciary" is not subject to the Act. *Id.* § 552.0035(a); *see also* Tex. R. Jud. Admin. 12. Consequently, records of the judiciary need not be released under the Act. *See* Attorney General Opinion DM-166 (1992). *But see Benavides v. Lee*, 665 S.W.2d 151 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1983, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 646 at 4 (1996) ("function that a governmental entity performs determines whether the entity falls within the judiciary exception to the . . . Act."). This office has determined a grand jury, for purposes of the Act, is a part of the judiciary and is, therefore, not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 411 (1984). Further, records kept by another person or entity acting as an agent for a grand jury are considered to be records in the constructive possession of the grand jury and, therefore, are not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 513 (1988), 398 (1983). *But see* ORD 513 at 4 (defining limits of judiciary exclusion). However, the fact that information collected or prepared by another person or entity is submitted to the grand jury does not necessarily mean such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession when the same information is also held in the other person's or entity's own capacity. Information held by another person or entity but not produced at the direction of the grand jury may well be protected under one of the Act's specific exceptions to disclosure, but such information is not excluded from the reach of the Act by the judiciary exclusion. *See id.* In this instance, we note the information at issue was created and maintained by the sheriff's office for the investigation of the incident at issue. Thus, we find the submitted information is subject to the Act. *See* Gov't Code § 552.002 (providing information collected, assembled, or maintained in connection with transaction of official business by governmental body is "public information"). Accordingly, we will address your exceptions to disclosure.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in 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

²We 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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 that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documentation sufficient to establish the applicability of this exception to the information at issue. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate that (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 the pending or anticipated litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *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 with "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." *Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986).* Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See 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.³ *See Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); see also 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. *See Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982).* Further, the fact a potential opposing party has

³In 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).*

hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You contend the county reasonably anticipates litigation pertaining to the submitted information because the requestor intends to sue the sheriff's office. You explain the requestor has informed you he was hired to represent an individual in a civil lawsuit against the sheriff's office and the purpose of his request is to obtain records related to that lawsuit. Based on your representations and our review, we find litigation was reasonably anticipated when the county received this request for information and the submitted information relates to the anticipated litigation. Accordingly, we find section 552.103 of the Government Code is applicable to the submitted information.

However, the information at issue involves alleged criminal activity. Information normally found on the front page of an offense or incident report is generally considered public. *Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976); *see* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976). This office has stated basic information about a crime may not be withheld under section 552.103 even if it is related to the litigation. Open Records Decision No. 362 (1983). Thus, we find the basic offense and arrest information may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.103. Therefore, with the exception of basic information, the county may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.⁴

We note once the information has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation, through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision No. 349 at 2 (1982). We also note the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends when the litigation is concluded or is no longer reasonably anticipated. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982) at 2; Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2.

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/>

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code, except to note that section 552.108 does not except from disclosure "basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime." Gov't Code § 552.108(c).

[orl_ruling_info.shtml](#), 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Kathryn R. Mattingly
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KRM/bhf

Ref: ID# 515239

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)