



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 17, 2015

Ms. Tracie Reilly
Assistant City Attorney
Public Safety Legal Advisor
City of Amarillo
200 Southeast Third Avenue
Amarillo, Texas 79109

OR2015-05124

Dear Ms. Reilly:

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# 556585 (Request Nos. 14-2278 & 14-2289).

The Amarillo Police Department (the "department") received two requests from the same requestor for all training protocols, policies, or manuals relating to undercover operations and undercover vehicles and the key card or identification card entry records for obtaining the keys to an undercover vehicle during a specified time period. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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

¹Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 552.108 of the Government Code, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass other exceptions found in the Act. See Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

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, 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). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a).

This office has long held that for the purposes of section 552.103, "litigation" includes "contested cases" conducted in a quasi-judicial forum. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 474 (1987), 368 (1983), 336 (1982), 301 (1982). In determining whether an administrative proceeding is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum, some of the factors this office considers are whether the administrative proceeding provides for discovery, evidence to be heard, factual questions to be resolved, the making of a record, and whether the proceeding is an adjudicative forum of first jurisdiction with appellate review of the resulting decision without a re-adjudication of fact questions. *See* Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991).

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 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, an attorney for a potential opposing party making a demand for payment and asserting an intent to sue if such payments are not made. Open Records Decision Nos. 555 at 3 (1990), 346 (1982). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision No. 288 at 2 (1981). However, an individual publicly threatening to bring suit against a governmental body, but who does

not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, is not concrete evidence that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 at 1-2 (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 requestor's client is a former department officer who has appealed his termination from the department. However, you have failed to provide any explanation as to how an appeal of termination constitutes litigation of a judicial or quasi-judicial nature for the purposes of section 552.103. *See generally* ORD 301 (discussing meaning of "litigation" under predecessor to section 552.103). Further, you have not demonstrated any party had taken concrete steps toward filing litigation against the department when the department received the requests. Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate the department reasonably anticipated litigation on the date of receipt of the instant requests for information. Consequently, the department may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code based on pending or anticipated litigation involving the department.

You also assert the submitted information is excepted under section 552.103 because the information relates to pending criminal litigation. However, we note the department is not a party to the litigation and, therefore, does not have a litigation interest in the matter for purposes of section 552.103. *See* Gov't Code § 552.103(a); Open Records Decision No. 575 at 2 (1990) (stating that statutory predecessor to section 552.103 only applies when governmental body is party to litigation). In such a situation, our office requires an affirmative representation from the governmental body with the litigation interest that the governmental body wants the information at issue withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Because you have not provided such a representation, the department may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a]n internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution . . . if . . . release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]" Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1). Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect "information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State." *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no writ). To demonstrate the applicability of this exception, a governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). This office has concluded section 552.108(b) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement

agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). Section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable, however, to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.*, ORDs 531 at 2-3 (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known). The determination of whether the release of particular records would interfere with law enforcement is made on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 409 at 2 (1984).

You state the submitted information includes the department's training materials pertaining to undercover operations and search procedures. We note you have also submitted information related to the use of specific undercover vehicles. You explain release of the submitted information "would allow citizens to anticipate weaknesses and to avoid detection and would specifically present a danger to officers acting in undercover investigations." Based on your arguments and our review, we find the information we have marked would interfere with law enforcement. Thus, the department may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. However, we find you have not demonstrated how release of any of the remaining information would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the department may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code. The department must release the remaining information; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only in accordance with copyright law.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tim Neal', written in a cursive style.

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/bhf

Ref: ID# 556585

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)