



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 1, 2017

Ms. Andrea D. Russell
Counsel to the City of Grandview
Taylor, Olson, Adkins, Sralla, Elam L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107-4654

OR2017-27393

Dear Ms. Russell:

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# 686577.

The City of Grandview (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for several categories of information pertaining to a specified city council meeting. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

We note a portion of the submitted information consists of an audio recording and minutes of a public meeting of the city council. Section 551.022 of the Open Meetings Act, chapter 551 of the Government Code, expressly provides the "minutes and tape recordings of an open meeting are public records and shall be available for public inspection and copying on request to the governmental body's chief administrative officer or the officer's designee." Gov't Code § 551.022. Accordingly, section 551.022 is applicable to the submitted recording and minutes. Although you raise section 552.103 of the Government Code, as a general rule, the exceptions to disclosure found in the Act, such as section 552.103, do not apply to information that other statutes make public. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 623 at 3 (1994), 525 at 3 (1989). Thus, the city must release the audio recording and minutes of the public meeting pursuant to chapter 551 of the Government Code.

Next, 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;

(5) all working papers, research material, and information used to estimate the need for or expenditure of public funds or taxes by a governmental body, on completion of the estimate[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3), (5). 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 subsection 552.022(a)(3) and budget information that is subject to subsection 552.022(a)(5). Although you seek to withhold the information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code, 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.); Open Records Decisions Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000), 663 at 5 (1999). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022, which we have marked, under section 552.103. However, we will address your argument against disclosure of the remaining information.

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 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable 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 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). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See 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.¹ Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). On the other hand, this office has determined that 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 that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You state, and provide supporting documentation showing, prior to the city’s receipt of the request, the city received a letter from an attorney stating he represents the city secretary who was placed on administrative leave prior to receipt of the instant request. In the letter, the attorney states he is notifying the city of his client’s claims against the city regarding her employment with the city and warns the city against retaliation. Thus, you state on the date the city received the request for information, the city reasonably anticipated litigation to which the city would be a party. Based on your representations and our review, we find the city reasonably anticipated litigation on the date the request was received. You also represent, and we agree, the remaining information is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Accordingly, the city may withhold the remaining information not subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

¹In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); 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).

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 party 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 audio recording and minutes of the public meeting pursuant to section 551.022 of the Government Code. The city must release the information we have marked under section 552.022 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 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, 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/gw

Ref: ID# 686577

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)