



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 31, 2015

Mr. Leonard V. Schneider  
Hunstville City Attorney  
Liles Parker, P.L.L.C.  
800 Rockmeade Drive, Suite 165  
Kingwood, Texas 77339

OR2015-15676

Dear Mr. Schneider:

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# 576685.

The City of Hunstville (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for seven categories of information related to the drainage improvement project at what is known as Town Creek. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

Initially, you state the city does not have information responsive to parts of the request and the request asks the city to conduct legal research. The Act does not require a governmental body to answer general questions, perform legal research, or create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dism'd); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990). However, a governmental body

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code, you make no arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn your claim this section applies to the submitted information. *See Gov't Code* §§ 552.301, .302.

<sup>2</sup>We 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.

must make a good-faith effort to relate a request to any responsive information that is within its possession or control. Open Records Decision No. 561 at 8-9 (1990). We assume the city has made a good-faith effort to do so.

Next, you inform us portions of the submitted information are presentations made by city staff to the city council at public meetings. We note the Act does not permit the selective disclosure of information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.007(b), .021; Open Records Decision No. 463 at 1-2 (1987). If information has been voluntarily released to any member of the public, then that same information may not subsequently be withheld unless public disclosure of the information is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential under law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007(a); Open Records Decision Nos. 518 at 3 (1989), 490 at 2 (1988); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 400 (1983) (governmental body may waive right to claim permissive exceptions to disclosure under the Act, but it may not disclose information made confidential by law). Accordingly, the city may not withhold previously released information unless its release is expressly prohibited by law or the information is confidential under law. Although you raise section 552.103 for the submitted information, this section is a discretionary exception and does not make information confidential. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the information that has been previously released under section 552.103. However, because section 552.130 of the Government Code can make information confidential, we will consider its applicability to the previously released information.<sup>3</sup> We will also consider your arguments against disclosure of the information that has not previously been released.

Section 552.103 provides, in part, as follows:

(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

---

<sup>3</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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).

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).

You assert the city reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information because, prior to the date the city received the present for information, the city received from the requestor written and verbal threats to sue the city on matters related to the submitted information. You also contend the city reasonably anticipates the requestor will carry through his threats because he has previously sued the city on other unrelated environmental issues. However, you do not inform our office that, at the time the city received the present request, anyone had taken any concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation against the city regarding this matter. Accordingly, we conclude the city has failed to establish it reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal

identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the license plates depicted in Exhibit C-2 under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address of a vendor who seeks to contract with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body on a letterhead. *See id.* § 552.137(c). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the personal, non-governmental e-mail address in Exhibit B under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

In summary, the license plates depicted in Exhibit C-2 must be withheld under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The personal e-mail address in Exhibit B must be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released.

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,



Ramsey A. Abarca  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RAA/dls

Ref: ID# 576685

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)