



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 12, 2019

Ms. Patricia A. Rigney  
City Attorney  
City of Pharr  
P.O. Box 1729  
Pharr, Texas 78577

OR2019-22228

Dear Ms. Rigney:

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# 779486 (PIR No. R001170-052319).

The City of Pharr (the "city") received a request for any and all communications between the city and the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD") during a specified time period. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.108, 552.111, and 552.116 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides 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

---

<sup>1</sup> We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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 to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing 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 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). See ORD 551.

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." See Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). 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 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). In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated a governmental body has met its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter and the governmental body represents that the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act, Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code, ch. 101. 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 litigation is reasonably anticipated. See Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You assert the submitted information is protected under section 552.103 of the Government Code because the city “reasonably anticipates either civil or criminal litigation” related to the matters discussed in the responsive information. However, upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the city reasonably anticipated litigation on the date the city received the request. Thus, we conclude the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides the following:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime;

(2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication;

(3) it is information relating to a threat against a peace officer or detention officer collected or disseminated under Section 411.048; or

(4) it is information that:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

(b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution;

(2) the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication; or

(3) the internal record or notation:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)-(b). A governmental body raising section 552.108 must explain the applicability of section 552.108. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). The city generally raises section 552.108 for the submitted information. A governmental body claiming subsection 552.108(a)(1) or subsection 552.108(b)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* § 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). The city states the submitted information pertains to an investigation conducted by HUD. Section 552.108 generally does not apply to records created by an agency whose chief function is essentially regulatory in nature. Open Records Decision No. 199 (1978). An agency that does not qualify as a law enforcement agency may, under certain limited circumstances, claim section 552.108 protects records in its possession. If an administrative agency's investigation reveals possible criminal conduct that the administrative agency intends to report or has already reported to the appropriate law enforcement agency, section 552.108 will apply to information gathered by the administrative agency if its release would interfere with law enforcement. *See Gov't Code* § 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1); Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision Nos. 493 at 1, 474 (1987), 372 at 4 (1983) (where incident involving allegedly criminal conduct is still under active investigation or prosecution, section 552.108 may be invoked by any proper custodian of information that relates to incident). However, the city does not explain how HUD is a law enforcement agency for purposes of section 552.108. Further, the city does not demonstrate the information at issue has been forwarded to an appropriate law enforcement agency. Accordingly, the city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of subsection 552.108(a)(1) or subsection 552.108(b)(1). A governmental body claiming subsection 552.108(a)(2) or subsection 552.108(b)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.108(a)(2), (b)(2). You have not demonstrated the information at issue pertains to any specific investigation that concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. Thus, the city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of either subsection 552.108(a)(2) or subsection 552.108(b)(2). Subsection 552.108(a)(3) is also inapplicable as the information does not relate to a threat against a police officer. *See id.* § 552.108(a)(3). Lastly, you do not assert the information at issue was prepared by an attorney representing the state or that it reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney

representing the state. *See id.* § 552.108(a)(4), (b)(3). Therefore, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

The city also asserts the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.111 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. This section 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). 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 that

- 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.

Although the city generally raises section 552.111, we find it has not demonstrated the applicability of that section to the information at issue. Therefore, the city may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.116 of the Government Code provides the following:

(a) An audit working paper of an audit of the state auditor or the auditor of a state agency, an institution of higher education as defined by Section 61.003, Education Code, a county, a municipality, a school district, a hospital district, or a joint board operating under Section 22.074, Transportation Code, including any audit relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021. If information in an audit working paper is also maintained in another record, that other record is not excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 by this section.

(b) In this section:

(1) "Audit" means an audit authorized or required by a statute of this state or the United States, the charter or an ordinance of a municipality, an order of the commissioners court of a county, the bylaws adopted by or other action of the governing board of a hospital district, a resolution or other action of a board of trustees of a school district, including an audit by the district relating to the criminal history background check of a public school employee, or a resolution or other action of a joint board described by Subsection (a) and includes an investigation.

(2) "Audit working paper" includes all information, documentary or otherwise, prepared or maintained in conducting an audit or preparing an audit report, including:

(A) intra-agency and interagency communications; and

(B) drafts of the audit report or portions of those drafts.

Gov't Code § 552.116. The city seeks to withhold the submitted information under section 552.116 of the Government Code. However, the purpose of section 552.116 is to protect the interests of the auditor, not the auditee. Here, HUD is the auditor, and the information at issue is maintained by the city, which is the auditee. As the auditee, the city may not assert section 552.116 to protect its own interests in withholding the information from disclosure. We note this office has received no arguments from HUD seeking to withhold the information at issue under section 552.116 of the Government Code. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.116 of the Government Code.

We note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue does not appear to be the type specifically excluded by subsection (c). Accordingly, the city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. The city must release the remaining 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](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,



Kimbell Kesling  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

KK/eb

Ref: ID# 779486

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>2</sup> The 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).