



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 13, 2017

Mr. Michael Shaunessy  
Counsel for the City of Hutto  
McGinnis Lochridge, LLP  
600 Congress Avenue, Suite 2100  
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2017-20966

Dear Mr. Shaunessy:

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# 676258.

The City of Hutto (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for a specified invoice and specified e-mail correspondence regarding a specified topic. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.104, 552.110, and 552.137 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Strategic Government Resources ("Strategic"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Strategic of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides, in relevant part, the following:

(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:

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3). The submitted information includes information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of funds by a governmental body that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3). The city must release this information, which we have marked, pursuant to section 552.022(a)(3), unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although the city raises section 552.103 of the Government Code for this information, section 552.103 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 section 552.103); Open Record Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 473 (1987) (section 552.103 may be waived). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) under section 552.103. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure for the information we marked, the city must this information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(3). However, we will consider the city's arguments against disclosure of the remaining information not subject to section 552.022(a)(3).

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in 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.

*Id.* § 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.<sup>1</sup> 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). This office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (the “EEOC”). *See* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982).

You assert, prior to its receipt of the instant request, the city reasonably anticipated litigation relating to charges of discrimination, retaliation, and wrongful termination made against a city official. You state, and provide documentation showing, prior to the city’s receipt of the instant request for information, three former city employees filed discrimination claims against the city with the EEOC. Furthermore, you state, and provide documentation showing, prior to the city’s receipt of the present request, the city received a litigation hold notice from the attorney representing the individuals who filed the EEOC complaints informing the city of its duty preserve all evidence relevant to the claims at issue. Based on

---

<sup>1</sup>In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

your representations and our review, we find the city reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. You assert, and we agree, the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a) of the Government Code. Therefore, we find the city may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

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. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing parties in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, the city must release the information we marked pursuant to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.

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,



Nicholas Ybarra  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

NY/tdw

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Ref: ID# 676258

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party  
(w/o enclosures)