



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 1, 2017

Mr. Glen Van Slyke
Assistant County Attorney
Harris County Attorney's Office
1019 Congress, 15th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002

OR2017-09225

Dear Mr. Van Slyke:

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# 655960.

The Harris County Engineering Department (the "department") received a request for information regarding specified complaints regarding the requestor's client. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). The submitted information contains a court-filed document that is subject to section 552.022(a)(17). This information must be released unless it is made

confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although you seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 of the Government Code, this section is discretionary in nature 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 Gov't Code § 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17), which we marked, may not be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, as sections 552.101 and 552.137 of the Government Code make information confidential under the Act, we will consider the applicability of these sections for the information at issue. Further, we will consider your claimed exceptions to disclosure for the remaining information not subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in part, the following:

(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 that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documentation sufficient to establish the applicability of this exception to the information that it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate that (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 the pending or anticipated 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). 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 provide this office “concrete evidence showing the claim that litigation may ensue 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 also* 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). We also note 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

We understand you to assert the department reasonably anticipates litigation involving the requestor’s client. You state, and provide documentation showing, the requestor is an attorney hired to represent his client in the matter at issue. However, you have not provided this office with evidence the requestor had taken any objective steps toward filing a lawsuit prior to the date the department received the request for information. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(e); Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Therefore, based on your representations, our review of the submitted information, and the totality of the circumstances, we find you have not established litigation was reasonably anticipated on the date the department received the request for information. Consequently, the department may not withhold the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). The informer’s privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority. *See* Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer’s privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to “administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres.” Open Records Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton Rev. Ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). However, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make a report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer’s privilege. The privilege excepts the informer’s statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer’s identity. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990). We note the

informer's privilege does not apply where the informant's identity is known to the individual who is the subject of the complaint. *See* ORD 208 at 1-2.

You state some of the submitted information, which you have marked, identifies a complainant who reported a violation of county floodplain management regulations to employees of the department. You explain the department is responsible for enforcing the regulations at issue. You also state a violation of the relevant regulations carries criminal penalties. We understand the subject of the complaint does not already know the identity of the informer. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude the department has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to some of the information at issue, which we have marked. Therefore, the department may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.¹ However, you have failed to demonstrate the remainder of the information you have marked consists of the identifying information of an individual who reported a criminal violation to the department for purposes of the informer's privilege. Accordingly, the department may not withhold the remaining information you have marked under section 552.101 on that basis. The department must release the remaining information.

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,



Ian Lancaster
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

IML/sb

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

Ref: ID# 655960

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)