



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 24, 2019

Mr. Alexander Garcia  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Corpus Christi  
P. O. Box 9277  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469-9277

OR2019-17130

Dear Mr. Garcia:

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# 771549 (SStr2)

The Corpus Christi Police Department (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You state the department will release some information to the requestor. You state the department will withhold some of the submitted information under section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and Open Records Letter No. 2016-00831 (2016).<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 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). Open Records Letter No. 2016-00831 authorizes the department to withhold dates of birth of members of the public under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without the necessity of requesting an attorney general's decision. *See id.* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 at 7-8 (2001).

<sup>2</sup>Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code, you make no arguments regarding this provision. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn your claim that this section applies to the submitted information. *See Gov't Code* §§ 552.301, .302.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in 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). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show section 552.103 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 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). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a).

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." *Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4* (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *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. *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 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 assert the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 because prior to the department's receipt of the instant request, the City of Corpus Christi (the "city") received a letter on behalf of the requestor regarding the city's liability for injuries sustained by the requestor during the accident involving a department officer. The

letter states the city is liable under Texas law for personal injuries suffered as a result of negligent acts or omissions by the city and its employees. Based on your representations, our review of the submitted information, and the totality of the circumstances, we find the city has established it reasonably anticipated litigation at the time the department received the instant request. You state the information at issue relates to the litigation because it pertains to the basis of the anticipated litigation. Accordingly, we find the department may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code on behalf of the city.

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

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,



Paige Lay  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PS/jxd

Ref: ID# 771549

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)