



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 5, 2017

Mr. Brett Norbraten  
Open Records Attorney  
Texas Department of Aging and Disability Services  
Texas Health and Human Services Commission  
P.O. Box 149030  
Austin, Texas 78714-9030

OR2017-14931

Dear Mr. Norbraten:

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# 664554 (DADS # 2017SOLEG0074 and 2017SOLEG0078).

The Texas Department of Aging and Disability Services (the "department") received two requests from different requestors for multiple categories of information pertaining to the termination of employment of the first requestor's client.<sup>1</sup> The department claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions the department claims and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>We note the department sought and received clarification of the first request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify the request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup>We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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

(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 purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information relating to litigation through discovery procedures. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4-5 (1990). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception applies 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 requested information 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. The governmental body must meet both parts of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

This office has long held that "litigation," for purposes of section 552.103, includes "contested cases" conducted in a quasi-judicial forum. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 474 (1987), 368 (1983), 336 (1982), 301 (1982). In determining whether an administrative proceeding is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum, some of the factors this office considers are whether the administrative proceeding provides for discovery, evidence to be heard, factual questions to be resolved, the making of a record, and whether the proceeding is an adjudicative forum of first jurisdiction with appellate review of the resulting decision without a re-adjudication of fact questions. *See* Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991).

The department states prior to its receipt of the instant requests, the first requestor's client filed an administrative grievance against the department. The department informs us the administrative grievance hearing is currently pending before a Health and Human Services Commission hearings officer. We understand, and the supporting documentation shows, during a hearing, the grievant may be represented by counsel, may have witnesses appear on her behalf, and will have the opportunity to examine and cross-examine witnesses. We

further understand, and the supporting documentation shows, the hearing includes a pre-hearing conference and a formal exchange between both parties of copies of exhibits to be used during the hearing and a list of all witnesses each party intends to call. Based on these representations and our review, we find the department has demonstrated the department's administrative grievance process is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum and therefore constitutes litigation for purposes of section 552.103 of the Government Code. Thus, we find the department was involved in pending litigation at the time it received the instant requests. The department also states the submitted information relates to the pending litigation. Upon review of the department's arguments and the information at issue, we find the submitted information is related to litigation involving the department that was pending on the date the requests were received. Accordingly, we find the department may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

We note once the information has been obtained by all parties to the pending litigation, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision No. 349 at 2 (1982). We also note the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends when the litigation is concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982) at 2; Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 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](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,



Rahat Huq  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RSH/tdw

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the department's remaining arguments against disclosure.

Ref: ID# 664554

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)