



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 1, 2015

Mr. Robert Russo
Counsel for Fort Sam Houston Independent School District
Walsh Gallegos Treviño Russo & Kyle P.C.
P.O. Box 460606
San Antonio, Texas 78246

OR2015-25034

Dear Mr. Russo:

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# 591776.

The Fort Sam Houston Independent School District (the "district") received two requests from the same requestor for information from a specified meeting, the requestor's interview panel notes, and any subsequent documentation obtained through an investigation that is set to take place. You state the district will release some responsive information. 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 the requestor seeks subsequent documentation obtained through an investigation that is set to take place. It is implicit in several provisions of the Act that the Act applies only to information already in existence. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.002, .021, .227, .351. The Act does not require a governmental body to prepare new information in response to a request. *See* Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 572 at 1 (1990), 555 at 1-2(1990), 452 at 2-3 (1986), 87 (1975). Consequently, a governmental body is not required to comply with a standing request to supply information prepared in the future. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-48 at 2 (1983); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 476 at 1 (1987), 465 at 1 (1987). Thus, the only information encompassed by the present requests consist of information the district maintained or had a right of access to as of the date it received the requests.

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).


You state the district reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the requests for information because, in the requests, the requestor states that the requested information is for "potential legal proceedings" and that she may obtain legal counsel. However, upon review, we find you have not demonstrated any party had taken concrete steps toward filing litigation when the district received the requests for information. Thus, we conclude you have failed to demonstrate the district reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the requests for

information. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code. Accordingly, the district must release the submitted information.¹

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,



Brian E. Berger
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BB/akg

Ref: ID# 591776

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

¹We note the information being released contains information to which the requestor has a right of access under section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987). However, we also note section 552.024(c) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting a decision under the Act if the current or former employee to whom the information pertains timely chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.024(c)(2). Thus, if the district receives another request for the submitted information from a different requestor, section 552.024(c) authorizes the district to withhold the requestor's personal information if the requestor has timely chosen not to allow access to the information.