



February 2, 2015

Ms. Caroline Cross  
Assistant District Attorney  
Civil Division  
Dallas County District Attorney's Office  
411 Elm Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Dallas, Texas 75202

OR2015-02048

Dear Ms. Cross:

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# 552155.

Dallas County (the "county") received a request for written and e-mail communications sent to or received by three named individuals for a specified time period concerning two specified topics.<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.104, and 552.107 of the Government Code. You also state the release of some of the submitted information may implicate the interests of Securus Technologies, Inc. ("Securus"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation demonstrating, the county notified Securus of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments stating why its information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining statutory predecessor

---

<sup>1</sup>You state the county sought and received clarification of the request for information. *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); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances). We received arguments from Securus. We have reviewed the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information, some of which you state constitutes a representative sample.<sup>2</sup>

Initially, we note a portion of the submitted information in Exhibit D, which we have marked, is not responsive to the present request for information because it does not consist of communications sent to or received by any of the three individuals named in the request. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request, and the county need not release such information in response to this request.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in part, the following:

(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 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 that it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received 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, 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.). The governmental

---

<sup>2</sup>This letter ruling assumes that the submitted representative sample of information is truly representative of the requested information as a whole. This ruling does not reach, and therefore does not authorize, the withholding of any other requested information to the extent that the other information is substantially different than that submitted to this office. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D), .302; Open Records Decision Nos. 499 at 6 (1988), 497 at 4 (1988).

body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).

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 provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue 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.<sup>3</sup> 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 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). We also note that 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You state the submitted information pertains to the county's award of a contract for a certain request for proposal. You explain an attorney for one of the companies that was not awarded the contract at issue sent the county several letters alleging flaws in the bidding process. Additionally, you state, and submit documentation showing, prior to the county's receipt of the present request for information, the attorney sent the county a letter in which the attorney stated the process "will not survive judicial scrutiny" and threatened the company would "take legal action to protect its rights and ensure the bid process is conducted in accordance with the law." Thus, we find the county reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. We also find the county established the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). Therefore, we conclude the county may withhold the submitted responsive information under section 552.103(a).<sup>4</sup>

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

---

<sup>3</sup>In addition, this office has concluded that 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).

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure.

anticipated. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982) at 2; Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2 (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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](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,



Lindsay E. Hale  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LEH/akg

Ref: ID# 552155

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Andrew Jones  
Corporate Counsel  
Securus Technologies, Inc.  
14651 Dallas Parkway, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Dallas, Texas 75254-8815  
(w/o enclosures)