



February 26, 2015

Ms. Heather Silver  
Assistant City Attorney  
Office of the City Attorney  
City of Dallas  
1500 Marilla Street, Room 7DN  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2015-03882

Dear Ms. Silver:

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# 555487.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for e-mails sent to or received by six named city employees during a specified time period that contain any of seven specified words. You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

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. This exception encompasses information made confidential by other

---

<sup>1</sup>You also claim this information is protected under the attorney-client privilege based on Texas Rule of Evidence 503. In this instance, however, the privilege claim is properly addressed here under section 552.107, rather than rule 503. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 3 (2002).

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

statutes, including section 418.182 of the Texas Homeland Security Act (the "HSA"), chapter 418 of the Government Code. Section 418.182 provides, in relevant part:

- (a) [I]nformation . . . in the possession of a governmental entity that relates to the specifications, operating procedures, or location of a security system used to protect public or private property from an act of terrorism or related criminal activity is confidential.

*Id.* § 418.182(a). The fact information may be related to a security system does not make such information *per se* confidential under section 418.182. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation by a governmental body of a statute's key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of a claimed provision. As with any exception to disclosure, a governmental body asserting section 418.182 must adequately explain how the responsive records fall within the scope of the statute. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

You state the information submitted as Exhibit F relates to a security system used to protect Dallas City Hall from acts of terrorism or related criminal activity. You state release of Exhibit F would reveal information relating to the specifications of the security system that could be used to identify and exploit weaknesses in the security system. Upon review, we find Exhibit F relates to the specifications and location of a security system used to protect public or private property from an act of terrorism or related criminal activity. Therefore, the city must withhold Exhibit F under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182 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.

*Id.* § 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.

You state Exhibits B, C, and D pertain to litigation pending in the city's municipal court in regard to a citation. Based on your representations and our review, we find that litigation to which the city is a party was pending on the date the city received the request. You state, and we agree, Exhibits B, C, and D are related to the litigation. Therefore, the city may withhold this information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

We note, however, the purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties seeking information relating to that litigation to obtain it through discovery procedures. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5. Thus, if the opposing party has seen or had access to information relating to the active litigation through discovery or otherwise, there is no interest in withholding such information from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). We also note the applicability of section 552.103 ends once the related litigation concludes. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, the city must withhold Exhibit F under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182 of the Government Code. The city may withhold Exhibits B, C, and D under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling on this information is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jennifer Luttrall". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the printed name.

Jennifer Luttrall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JL/akg

Ref: ID# 555487

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)