



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 18, 2016

Ms. Criselda Palacios
City Attorney
City of Edinburg
P.O. Box 1079
Edinburg, Texas 78540

Mr. Jose Hernandez
Records Supervisor
Edinburg Police Department
1702 South Closner Boulevard
Edinburg, Texas 78539

OR2016-08634

Dear Ms. Palacios and Mr. Hernandez:

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# 606172 (CoE ID# 83607).

The City of Edinburg (the "city") received a request for law enforcement records pertaining to the requestor and two named individuals over a specified time period. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.130, and 552.147 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes a court-filed document. Section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code provides for required public disclosure of "information that is also contained in a public court record," unless the information is made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). Although the city asserts the court-filed document is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code, this section is discretionary 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 section 552.103); Open Records Decision No. 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). As such, section 552.103 does not make information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the court-filed document, which we have marked, under section 552.103. As you raise no other arguments for the court-filed document, it must be released.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Section 261.201 of the Family Code provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

...

(k) Notwithstanding Subsection (a), an investigating agency, other than the [Texas Department of Family and Protective Services] or the Texas Juvenile Justice Department, on request, shall provide to the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child who is the subject of reported abuse or neglect, or to the child if the child is at least 18 years of age, information concerning the reported abuse or neglect that would otherwise be confidential under this section. The investigating agency shall withhold information under this subsection if the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of the child requesting the information is alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect.

(l) Before a child or a parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child may inspect or copy a record or file concerning the child under Subsection (k), the custodian of the record or file must redact:

...

(2) any information that is excepted from required disclosure under [the Act], or other law; and

(3) the identity of the person who made the report.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a), (k), (l)(2)–(3). We note portions of the remaining information, report numbers 2015-00016059 and 2015-00015698, were used or developed in investigations of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect made to the city’s police department. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). Accordingly, we find this information is subject to section 261.201 of the Family Code. In this instance, the requestor is a parent of the child victim listed in the information, and is not alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect. Thus, pursuant to section 261.201(k), the information at issue may not be withheld from this requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of section 261.201(a). *See id.* § 261.201(k). However, section 261.201(l)(3) states the identity of the reporting party shall be withheld from disclosure. *Id.* § 261.201(l)(3). Additionally, section 261.201(l)(2) states any information that is excepted from required disclosure under the Act or other law must still be withheld from disclosure. *Id.* § 261.201(l)(2). Accordingly, we will consider your remaining arguments against disclosure of the remaining information.

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). 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 (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 that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). 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). 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”), Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code, ch. 101. If a governmental body does not make this representation, the claim letter is a factor this office will consider in determining whether a governmental body has established litigation is reasonably anticipated based on the totality of the circumstances. 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 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 state, and provide documentation showing, prior to the date the city received the instant request for information, the city received a notice of claim letter from the requestor on behalf of his client. You do not state this letter meets the requirements of the TTCA; therefore, we will only consider the claim as a factor in determining whether the city reasonably anticipated litigation. We note the notice of claim letter states it serves “as a preservation of the right to file a lawsuit for the violation of [the requestor’s] client’s civil rights and his wrongful and false imprisonment . . .” Thus, based on your representations, our review of the remaining information, and the totality of the circumstances, we determine the city has established it reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the request for information. Further, we find the information at issue relates to the anticipated litigation as it pertains to the claim

alleged in the notice of claim letter. Therefore, section 552.103 of the Government Code is generally applicable to the remaining information.

However, the information at issue involves alleged criminal activity. Information normally found on the front page of an offense or incident report is generally considered public. *See Houston Chronical Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976); Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). We note basic information includes, among other items, the identity and description of the complainant. *See* ORD 127 at 3-4. This office has determined section 552.103 does not except from release basic information about a crime. *See* Open Records Decision No. 362 at 2 (1983). Therefore, we find the basic offense information from the offense reports may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.103 of the Government Code. Consequently, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.¹

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through 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 or anticipated 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).

As noted above, section 261.201(l)(3) of the Family Code states the identity of the reporting party shall be withheld from disclosure. Fam. Code § 261.201(l)(3). Consequently, in releasing the basic information, the city must withhold the identifying information of the reporting party, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(l)(3) of the Family Code.

In summary, the city must release the marked court-filed document pursuant to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. With the exception of the basic information, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. In releasing the basic information, the city must withhold the identifying

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of the remaining information.

information of the reporting party, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(1)(3) of the Family Code.²

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,



Gerald A. Arismendez
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

GAA/dls

Ref: ID# 606172

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

²We note the requestor has a right of access to the information being released in this instance. If the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001).