



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 28, 2019

Ms. Anastasia Broadfoot
Attorney, Office of General Counsel
Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission
P.O. Box 13127
Austin, Texas 78711-3137

OR2019-17892

Dear Ms. Broadfoot:

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# 772914 (Records Request No. R000754-022619).

The Texas Alcoholic Beverage Commission (the "commission") received a request for specified information pertaining to access to a specified commission building, as well as information pertaining to telecommuting privileges for commission employees.¹ The commission claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the commission claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the commission has only submitted information responsive to a portion of the request for information. To the extent any information responsive to the remaining portion of the request existed on the date the commission received the request, we assume the commission has released it. If the commission has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. *See* 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 552.103 of the Government Code provides in relevant part as follows:

¹The commission states it sought and received clarification of the request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

(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 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 that 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 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). Decision Nos. 555 (1990), 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated").

The commission states it reasonably anticipates litigation involving the requestor because prior to the instant request for information, the commission received a demand letter from the requestor's attorney. The letter at issue alleges "there was no legitimate reason [for the commission] to terminate [the requestor's] employment." Further, the letter alleges "[the commission's] actions constitute retaliation against [the requestor] for exercising her protected First Amendment Rights." The commission also informs us the demand letter

demands payment and threatens litigation. Based on these representations, our review of the submitted documentation, and the totality of the circumstances, we find the commission has established it reasonably anticipated litigation at the time it received the instant request. We further find the information at issue relates to the anticipated litigation based on the commission's representation that the requestor seeks information pertaining to the commission position from which she was terminated. Therefore, the commission may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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 pending 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).

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,



Lecelle Clarke
Attorney
Open Records Division

LC/gw

Ref: ID# 772914

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)