



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 8, 2019

Ms. Julie P. Doshier
Counsel for the City of Allen
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager, & Smith, LLP
500 North Akard Street, Suite 1800
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2019-31639

Dear Ms. Doshier:

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# 795977 (Reference No. W005641-082019).

The City of Allen (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for video recordings from a specified incident. 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.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in part, the following:

(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).

In order to demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation might ensue is more than mere conjecture.” Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). In the context of anticipated litigation in which the governmental body is the prospective plaintiff, the concrete evidence must at least reflect that litigation is “realistically contemplated.” *See* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989); *see also* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982) (finding that investigatory file may be withheld from disclosure if governmental body attorney determines that it should be withheld pursuant to section 552.103 and that litigation is “reasonably likely to result”). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* ORD 452 at 4.

You inform us the submitted information relates to an automobile accident between a city police officer and a public citizen in which the officer was injured. You state, and submit documentation demonstrating, the city filed a claim with the citizen's insurance carrier. You further state, and provide documentation demonstrating, the city filed a claim with its workers' compensation carrier. You state that if the claims are not settled, the city may file suit. You state the statute of limitations has yet to run on either claim. Based on your representations, our review of the submitted information, and the totality of the circumstances, we determine the city reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. We agree the information at issue relates to the anticipated litigation. Therefore, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note once the information has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation, through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision No. 349 at 2 (1982). We also note the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends when the litigation is concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 at 2 (1982); Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2.

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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Patrick P. Mehaffy". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Patrick P. Mehaffy
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PPM/be

Ref: ID# 795977

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)