



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 3, 2017

Ms. Stacie S. White
Counsel for City of Blue Mound
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam LLP
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2017-17506

Dear Ms. White:

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# 669383.

The Blue Mound Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident and specified policies regarding emergency services. You state the department will withhold motor vehicle record information under section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and social security numbers under section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ Further, you state the department will redact certain information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).² You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103

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). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision under the Act. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

²Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in relevant 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). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show section 552.103(a) is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing 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 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 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551.

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." *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* 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 hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, or when an individual threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 346 (1982), 288 (1981). 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 litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983). In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated a governmental body has met its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter and the governmental body represents that the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act (“TTCA”), Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code, ch. 101, or an applicable municipal ordinance. If that representation is not made, the receipt of a claim letter is a factor we will consider in determining, from the totality of the circumstances presented, whether the governmental body has established litigation in reasonably anticipated.

You state, and provide documentation showing, on the date the department received the instant request for information, the department received a notice of claim from an attorney who represents the estate of a deceased individual involved in the specified incident. You do not affirmatively represent to this office the notice of claim complies with the TTCA; therefore, we will only consider the notice of claim as a factor in determining whether the department reasonably anticipated litigation over the incident in question. Nevertheless, based on your representation, our review of the submitted information, and the totality of the circumstances, we determine the department has established it reasonably anticipated litigation prior to the date it received the request for information. We further find the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Accordingly, we conclude the department may generally withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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.³

We further note 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

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.

discovery procedures. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5. Thus, 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). Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends when the litigation has concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 at 2 (1982); 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, 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,



Paige Lay
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PL/eb

Ref: ID# 669383

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)