



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 7, 2019

Ms. Laura Garza Jimenez
County Attorney
Nueces County
901 Leopard, Suite 207
Corpus Christi, Texas 78401-3680

OR2019-15223

Dear Ms. Jimenez:

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# 769468 (CA #19-OR-045).

The Nueces County Clerk's Office (the "county clerk's office") received a request for videos pertaining to specified incidents regarding the requestor and certain other clerk's office employees, certain employee login sheets, and e-mails saved by the requestor from two named individuals. You inform us, due to the retention policies of the county clerk's office, the county clerk's office does not have information responsive to a portion of the request.¹ 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.

Initially, we note you have marked some of the submitted information as not responsive to the instant request. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the county clerk's office is not required to release non-responsive information in response to this request.

¹The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

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). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of section 552.103 to the information it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate: (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of 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 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *See Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).*

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 furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *Id.* 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).*

This office has long held that for the purposes of section 552.103, "litigation" includes "contested cases" conducted in a quasi-judicial forum. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 474 (1987), 368 (1983), 336 (1982), 301 (1982). Likewise, "contested cases" conducted under the Texas Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 2001 of the Government Code, constitute "litigation" for purposes of section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 588 (1991) (concerning former State Board of Insurance proceeding), 301 (concerning hearing before Public Utilities Commission). 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* ORD 588.

You argue the county clerk's office was involved in litigation with respect to the responsive information because prior to the date of the instant request, the requestor, a named former employee, filed a claim with the Texas Workforce Commission (the "commission") for unemployment benefits. You also inform us the claim was outstanding at the time of the request. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate an unemployment compensation claim hearing constitutes litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Furthermore, you have failed to demonstrate any individual had taken any objective steps toward litigation against the county clerk's office with respect to the responsive information prior to the date the county clerk's office received the request for information. Thus, the county clerk's office has failed to demonstrate it reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the request, and we conclude the county clerk's office may not withhold any portion of the responsive information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.² Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.117 is also applicable to cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (statutory predecessor to section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers provided and paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for the information is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former official or employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

date on which the request for information was made. Accordingly, the county clerk's office must withhold the cellular telephone number we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code if the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. The city may not withhold this information if the individual whose information is at issue did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential or the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body. As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the county clerk's office must release the remaining responsive information.

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,



Britni Ramirez
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BR/sb

Ref: ID# 769468

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)