



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 10, 2017

Mr. John S. Schneider
First Assistant City Attorney
City of Pasadena
P.O. Box 672
Pasadena, Texas 77501-0672

OR2017-23001

Dear Mr. Schneider:

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# 679078 (ORR #SL1755).

The City of Pasadena (the "city") received a request for: (1) information pertaining to a specified citation; (2) specified reports pertaining to a specified location; (3) specified regulations and training materials; and (4) information pertaining to traffic tickets issued during a specified period of time. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note you have only submitted information responsive to the first category of the requested information. To the extent any additional information responsive to this request existed and was maintained by the city on the date the city received the request, we assume the city has released it. If the city has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or

¹Although the city raises section 552.022 of the Government Code, we note this section is not an exception to disclosure under the Act.

prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state the information at issue pertains to a pending criminal prosecution. We note the information at issue includes a citation. Because a copy of the citation was provided to the individual who was cited, we find release of the citation will not interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). We therefore conclude the citation may not be withheld under section 552.108(a)(1). Based on your representation and our review, we conclude the release of the remaining information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, we find the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.²

You also claim the citation is excepted under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 provides, in relevant 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 claiming section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request, 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). The

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

We 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 related to litigation through the discovery process. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5. If the opposing party has seen or had access to information related to pending or anticipated litigation, through discovery or otherwise, then there is no interest in withholding that information from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). In this instance, you state the citation is related to a pending prosecution. We note the recipient of the citation is the defendant in the prosecution. Thus, as the opposing party in the litigation has already seen the citation at issue, we conclude the city may not withhold any portion of the citation under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.111. Section 552.111 encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines work product as

(1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or

(2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party’s representatives or among a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5. A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party’s representative. TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied

a) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue; and b) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation.

Nat'l Tank Co. v. Brotherton, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A “substantial chance” of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather “that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear.” *Id.* at 204; ORD 677 at 7.


The city also claims the attorney work product privilege of section 552.111 of the Government Code for the citation. Upon review, we find the city has not demonstrated the information at issue consists of mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of a party or party’s representative prepared in anticipation of litigation or for trial. Therefore, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of the work product privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under the work product privilege of section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of the submitted citation, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.³

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,



Ellen Webking
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EW/tdw

³We note the requestor has a right of access beyond that of the general public to some of the information being released. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person or person’s representative to whom information relates on grounds that information is considered confidential under privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Accordingly, if the city receives another request for this information from an individual other than this requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office.

Ref: ID# 679078

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)