



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 19, 2014

Mr. Henry W. Prejean
Chief Civil Attorney
Williamson County
405 M.L.K. Street #7
Georgetown, Texas 78626

OR2014-14591

Dear Mr. Prejean:

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# 533330.

Williamson County (the "county") received a request for information about the applicant selected/hired for a specified position. You state the county is providing some of the requested information to the requestor with redactions pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.¹ You claim the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.² We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See Gov't Code* § 552.304

¹We note section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *Gov't Code* § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e).

²We assume that 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.

(interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, the requestor asserts he was not timely sent the information he requested from the county or notified as required by section 552.301(d) of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.301(d) (governmental body must provide requestor with copy of governmental body's written communication to attorney general asking for decision). Pursuant to section 552.302, a governmental body's failure to timely provide the requestor with a copy of its written communication to this office results in the presumption that the information is public. We note the county received the request on June 1, 2014. The county sought clarification of the request on June 5, 2014, and the requestor clarified the request on June 6, 2014. *See id.* § 552.222 (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (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). Accordingly, the county's ten-business-day deadline was June 20, 2014. The county requested a ruling from this office on June 12, 2014. *See id.* § 552.308(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Therefore, the county's request for a decision to this office was timely submitted and shows it was copied to the requestor. This office is unable to resolve disputes of fact in the open records ruling process. Accordingly, we must rely upon the facts alleged to us by the governmental body requesting our opinion, or upon those facts that are discernable from the documents submitted for our inspection. *See Open Records Decision No. 522 at 4* (1990). Based on the submitted information, we find the county complied with the procedural requirements of section 552.301(d) in copying the requestor on the correspondence requesting this ruling.

You claim that the information at issue is protected under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 of the Government Code 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). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show section 552.103(a) applies in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the requested information is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *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). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). 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.” *Id.* 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). This office has stated a pending complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (the “EEOC”) indicates litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision Nos. 386 at 2 (1983), 336 at 1 (1982).

You state, and submit documentation demonstrating, prior to the county’s receipt of the clarified request, the requestor filed a charge of discrimination with the EEOC. You contend the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation. Based on your representations, the submitted documentation, and our review, we find you have demonstrated the information at issue is related to litigation reasonably anticipated at the time the county received the request for information. Therefore, we find the county may withhold the information at issue under section 552.103.


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/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,


Ellen Webking
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EW/ac

Ref: ID# 533330

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)