



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 3, 2015

Ms. Donna L. Clarke  
Assistant Criminal District Attorney  
Civil Division  
County of Lubbock  
P.O. Box 10536  
Lubbock, Texas 79408-3536

OR2015-23084

Dear Ms. Clarke:

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# 585865.

Lubbock County (the "county") received a request for the personnel files of two named individuals. The county claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the county claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that portions of the submitted information are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information contains performance evaluations subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The completed evaluations must be released pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless the information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 or is made confidential under the Act or other law. You seek to withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, section 552.103 is a discretionary exception and does not make information confidential under the Act. *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 Gov't Code § 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the submitted evaluations, which we have marked, may not be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We will consider the county's arguments against disclosure of the remaining information not subject to section 552.022.

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.

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 county states it reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information because, prior to receipt of the request, the attorney for one of the named individuals in the request sent a “spoilation letter” entitled “*Luisa Florez v. Lubbock County*,” in which he referred to the county as defendant. The attorney states in the letter that if the defendants fail to preserve potentially relevant evidence, the attorney “will not hesitate to seek sanctions or request the appropriate jury instruction.” Thus, we find the county reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. We also find the county has established the submitted information is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). Therefore, we agree the county may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103(a).

However, once the information has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision No. 349 at 2 (1982). We also note the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends when the litigation has concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 at 2 (1982); Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2.

In summary, the county must release the submitted evaluations, which we have marked, under section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. The county may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.

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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Katelyn Blackburn-Rader".

Katelyn Blackburn-Rader  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KB-R/akg

Ref: ID# 585865

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)