



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 12, 2017

Mr. Pink Dickens  
Assistant Criminal District Attorney  
Victoria County Criminal District Attorney's Office  
205 North Bridge, Suite 301  
Victoria, Texas 77901-8085

OR2017-07725

Dear Mr. Dickens:

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# 653110.

The Victoria County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office") received a request for information regarding a specified incident involving the requestor on a specified date. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

...

(2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]

...

(b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

...

(2) the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2), (b)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) or section 552.108(b)(2) must demonstrate the information at issue relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). However, section 552.108 is generally not applicable to records of an internal affairs investigation that is purely administrative in nature and does not involve the criminal investigation or prosecution of alleged misconduct. *See, e.g., Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 526 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution); Open Records Decision No. 350 at 3-4 (1982). You state the submitted information pertains to a case that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude sections 552.108(a)(2) and 552.108(b)(2) are applicable to the information we have marked. However, the remaining information at issue consists of an internal affairs investigation of officers of the sheriff's office that is purely administrative in nature. As a result, we find the sheriff's office has failed to demonstrate the applicability of sections 552.108(a)(2) and 552.108(b)(2) to the remaining information at issue. Accordingly, the sheriff's office may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under sections 552.108(a)(2) and 552.108(b)(2) of the Government Code.

Further, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing 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 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). Thus, with the exception of basic information, the sheriff's office may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides 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 the section 552.103(a) exception 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. *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.

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 establish 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, 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 that 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. 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 generally state the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. However, you have not demonstrated the sheriff's office reasonably anticipated litigation on the date the request was received, nor have you informed us of any litigation which was pending on the date the request was received. *See* ORD 331. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.103 to the information at issue. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.103(c) (governmental body must demonstrate that litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on or before the date it received request for information), .301(e)(1) (requiring governmental body to explain applicability of raised exception). Accordingly, the sheriff's office may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the sheriff's office may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The sheriff's office must release the remaining information.<sup>2</sup>

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,



Ian Lancaster  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

IML/sb

---

<sup>2</sup>We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Thus, if the district receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the district must again seek a decision from this office.

Ref: ID# 653110

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)