



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 29, 2015

Mr. Ryan D. Pittman
Counsel for the City of Frisco
Abernathy Roeder Boyd & Hullett P.C.
P.O. Box 1210
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2015-20381

Dear Mr. Pittman:

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# 580911.

The City of Frisco (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified zoning application for a specified period of time. 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. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note you have marked portions of the submitted information as not responsive to the present request for information. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the city need not release non-responsive information to the requestor.

Next, we address the requestor's contention that the city did not comply with the procedural requirements of the Act. Pursuant to section 552.301(d) of the Government Code, a governmental body must provide the requestor with (1) a written statement the governmental body wishes to withhold the requested information and has asked for a decision from the attorney general, and (2) a copy of the governmental body's written communication to the attorney general within ten business days of receiving the request for information.

Id. § 552.301(d). Section 552.301(e-1) of the Government Code requires a governmental body that submits written comments to the attorney general under section (e)(1)(A) to send a copy of those comments to the person who requested the information from the governmental body within fifteen business days of receiving the request for information. *Id.* § 552.301(e-1). Upon review, however, we find the city's brief to this office, in which the city requests a decision from this office and provides arguments in support of its claimed exception to disclosure, was timely submitted and contains a notation the requestor was copied on the brief. Thus, we conclude the city complied with the requirements of sections 552.301(d) and 552.301(e-1) of the Government Code.

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.

...

(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) is applicable 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 information at issue 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.

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555

(1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, or when an individual threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 346 (1982), 288 (1981). In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated a governmental body has met its burden of showing litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter and the governmental body represents the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act (“TTCA”), chapter 101 of the Civil Practices and Remedies Code, or an applicable municipal ordinance. On the other hand, this office has determined 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 anticipated. *See* 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 litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You assert the city reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the request for information. However, upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any party had taken concrete steps toward filing litigation against the city when the city received the request for information. Thus, we conclude you have failed to demonstrate the city reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Therefore, the city may not withhold the responsive information under section 552.103(a) 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).¹ Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, an Internet website address, an e-mail address that a governmental entity maintains for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body by a person who has or seeks a contractual relationship with the governmental body or by the contractor’s agent. *See id.* § 552.137(c). We note the requestor has a right of access to his own e-mail address under section 552.137(b). *See id.* § 552.137(b). Accordingly, with the exception of the requestor’s e-mail address, the city must withhold the submitted e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure or subsection (c) applies. The remaining responsive information must be released.

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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 cursive script that reads "Paigelay".

Paige Lay
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PL/bhf

Ref: ID# 580911

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)