



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 30, 2016

Mr. Renatto Garcia
Legal Department
Assistant City Attorney
City of Corpus Christi
P.O. Box 9277
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469-9277

OR2016-22056

Dear Mr. Garcia:

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# 628491 (CCPD File No. C1602163).

The Corpus Christi Police Department (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to a specified investigation. You state you have released some information to the requestor, including the CR-3 crash report pursuant to section 550.065 of the Transportation Code. *See* Transp. Code § 550.065(c) (providing for release of accident report to person or entity listed under this subsection). We understand you will redact information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and Open Records Letter No. 2011-16393 (2011).¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under

¹Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Open Records Letter No. 2011-16393 is a previous determination authorizing the department to withhold, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code, the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers furnished to the department by a 9-1-1 service supplier established in accordance with chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (governmental body may rely on previous determination when elements of law, facts, and circumstances have not changed, decision concludes specific, clearly delineated category of information is excepted, and governmental body is explicitly informed it need not seek a decision from this office to withhold information in response to future requests).

section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in 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 section 552.103 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).

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." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that 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. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). 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 that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You assert the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 because, concurrent with the department's receipt of the instant request, the City of Corpus Christi (the "city") received a notice of claim letter on behalf of the requestor's client regarding the city's liability for injuries and damages sustained by the requestor's client during the accident specified in the request. We note, however, the department is not a party to the anticipated litigation. Therefore, the department does not have a litigation interest in the matter for purposes of section 552.103. *See* Gov't Code § 552.103(a); Open Records Decision No. 575 at 2 (1990). In such a situation, we require an affirmative representation from the governmental body with the litigation interest that the governmental body wants the information at issue withheld from disclosure under section 552.103(a). You, as a representative of the city, affirmatively represent that the city objects to the release of the information at issue under section 552.103(a). You do not affirmatively represent to this office the notice of claim complies with the TTCA or an applicable ordinance; therefore, we will only consider the claim as a factor in determining whether the city reasonably anticipated litigation over the incident in question. Nevertheless, based on your representations, our review of the submitted information, and the totality of the circumstances, we find the city has established it reasonably anticipated litigation at the time the department received the instant request. You state the information at issue relates to the litigation because it pertains to the basis of the anticipated litigation. Accordingly, we find the department may generally withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code on behalf of the city.

We note, 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. *Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976); *see* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). This office has stated basic information about a crime may not be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code, even if it is related to litigation. Open Records Decision No. 362 (1983). Thus, we find the basic offense information from the information at issue may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.103. Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; ORD 127. Therefore, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the department may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code on behalf of the city.

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 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 concluded. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* 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,



Cristian Rosas-Grillet
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CRG/bw

Ref: ID# 628491

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)