



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 4, 2015

Mr. Daniel Ortiz
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of El Paso
P.O. Box 1890
El Paso, Texas 79950-1890

OR2015-15994

Dear Mr. Ortiz:

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# 574161 (15-1026-6234).

The City of El Paso (the "city") received a request for the MVR recordings related to a specified case number. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exception the city claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant 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.

¹Although the city also raises section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and constitutional privacy for the submitted information, the city provides no arguments explaining how these doctrines are applicable to the information at issue. Therefore, we assume the city no longer asserts these doctrines. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

...

(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).

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).

The city asserts it reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. The city states, and provides documentation showing, prior to its receipt of the request for information, the city received a demand letter for compensation of damages from an injured party who is not an attorney. However, upon review, we find the city has not demonstrated any party had taken concrete steps toward filing litigation when the city received the request for information. Thus, we conclude the city has failed to demonstrate it reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.

We note portions of the submitted information are subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code.² Section 552.130 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 motor vehicle record information we have indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

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,



Rahat Huq
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RSH/som

Ref: ID# 574161

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).