KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 9, 2015

Mr. Frank J. Garza
Counsel for the City of Kyle
Davidson, Troilo, Ream & Garza, P.C.
7550 West Interstate 10, Suite 800
San Antonio, Texas 78229-5815

OR2015-18807

Dear Mr. Garza:

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# 578428.

The City of Kyle (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident occurring at a specified address. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant request because it was created after the date the request was received. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the city is not required to release non-responsive information in response to this request.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant 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 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception 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). The governmental body must meet both parts of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

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, 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.[1] Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). On the other hand, this office has determined that 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

---

[1]In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: 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).

anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, 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. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983). This office has concluded a governmental body's receipt of a claim letter it represents to be in compliance with the notice requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act (the "TTCA"), chapter 101 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code, is sufficient to establish litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 638 at 4 (1996). If that representation is not made, the receipt of the claim letter is a factor we will consider in determining, from the totality of the circumstances presented, whether the governmental body has established litigation is reasonably anticipated. *Id.*

You state the city anticipates litigation involving the requestor's client because prior to the city's receipt of the present request for information, the city received a notice of claim letter from the requestor alleging the city's liability for damages caused by injuries the requestor's client sustained as a result of being attacked by dogs from the specified address. You do not affirmatively represent to this office the notice of claim complies with the TTCA or an applicable ordinance; therefore, we will only consider the claim as a factor in determining whether the city reasonably anticipated litigation over the incident in question. Nevertheless, based on your representations, our review of the submitted information, and the totality of the circumstances, we find the city has established it reasonably anticipated litigation at the time it received the instant request. We further find the information at issue relates to the anticipated litigation. Accordingly, the city may withhold the responsive information pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code.

However, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation though discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to all parties to the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (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, 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,

Britni Fabian
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BF/bhf

Ref: ID# 578428

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)