



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 21, 2015

Mr. Gary Grief
Executive Director
Texas Lottery Commission
P.O. Box 16630
Austin, Texas 78761-6330

OR2015-22110

Dear Mr. Grief:

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# 584087 (TLC File # L-20290).

The Texas Lottery Commission (the "commission") received a request for the badge access records pertaining to a named individual during a specified time period.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the requestor specifically excluded from her request any security information. Accordingly, this type of information is not responsive to the present request. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request, and the commission is not required to release such information in response to this request.²

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part, as follows:

¹You state the commission sought and received clarification of the request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information).

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.

(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). Further, concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may also include 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. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* 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 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 commission reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the instant request. You explain, and provide documentation showing, prior to the commission's receipt of the request for information, the commission receive a verified petition to take depositions before suit from the requestor's attorney seeking to depose the commission's staff to investigate claims. You also state the commission received demand letters from several consumers through their attorneys threatening litigation against the commission regarding a specified game. Upon review, we find the commission demonstrated litigation was reasonably anticipated when it received the request for information. You state the requested information relates to the anticipated litigation because plaintiff's counsel sought the same information during the deposition of a commission employee. Thus, we find the commission has established the responsive information is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). Therefore, we agree the commission may withhold the responsive information under section 552.103(a).

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. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

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,



Cole Hutchison
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CH/som

Ref: ID# 584087

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)