



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 11, 2015

Ms. Leticia D. McGowan  
School Attorney  
Dallas Independent School District  
3700 Ross Avenue  
Dallas, Texas 75204-5491

OR2015-26034

Dear Ms. McGowan:

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# 592733 (ORR# 14605).

The Dallas Independent School District (the "district") received a request for specified audio recordings and transcripts involving a named former employee. The district states it does not have some of the requested information.<sup>1</sup> The district claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exception and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information contains recordings of open meetings of the district's board. Section 551.022 of the Open Meetings Act, chapter 551 of the Government Code, expressly provides the "minutes and tape recordings of an open meeting are public records and shall be available for public inspection and copying on request to the governmental body's chief administrative officer or the officer's designee." Gov't Code § 551.022. Accordingly, section 551.022 is applicable to these recordings. Although the district raises section 552.103 of the Government Code, we note the exceptions to disclosure found in the Act are generally not applicable to information that other statutes make public. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 623 at 3 (1994), 525 at 3 (1989)*. Therefore, the district may not withhold the submitted recordings of open board meetings under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

The district asserts the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code, which provides in part as follows:

---

<sup>1</sup>The Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist when the request for information was received. *See generally Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed).

(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 district informs us (1) it terminated the named former employee; (2) the former employee grieved her termination through the district's grievance process; and (3) the district's board panel upheld the termination. The district explains an attorney for the former employee sent a demand letter to the district on September 30, 2015, the day before the district received the request for information, seeking a settlement of the former employee's claims related to her termination. Upon review, we conclude, for purposes of

section 552.103, the district has established litigation was reasonably anticipated when it received the request for information. We also find the district has established the records at issue are related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). Therefore, we agree the district may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

However, we note 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 (1982) at 2; Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2.

To conclude, the district must release the submitted recordings of open board meetings pursuant to section 551.022 of the Government Code. The district may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 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,

  
James L. Coggeshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLC/bhf

Ref: ID# 592733

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)