



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 10, 2019

Ms. Sylvia McClellan  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Dallas  
1400 South Lamar, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor, 6W  
Dallas, Texas 75215

OR2019-34645

Dear Ms. McClellan:

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# 799643 (ORR# D027782).

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident.<sup>1</sup> The city indicates it has released the police officer's crash report pursuant to section 550.065(c) of the Transportation Code. *See* Transp. Code § 550.065(c) (providing for release of accident report to person or entity listed under this subsection). The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.108, 552.111, 552.117, and 552.136 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions the city claims and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The city states it sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information not responsive to the instant request for information because it was created after the date the city received the clarified request for information. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983). This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the city is not required to release such information in response to this request.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in relevant 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 the section 552.103(a) exception 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 refused 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 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." *Id.* In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated a governmental body has met its burden of showing litigation is reasonably anticipated by representing it received a notice-of-claim letter that is in compliance with the Texas Tort Claims Act ("TTCA"), chapter 101 of the Civil Practices and Remedies Code. If that representation is not made, the receipt of the claim letter is a factor we will consider in determining, from the totality of the circumstances presented, whether the governmental body has established litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* ORD 638 at 4.

The city claims the submitted documents are subject to section 552.103 of the Government Code. The city informs us, and provides documentation demonstrating, on the date the city received the request for information, the city also received correspondence from a law firm asserting a claim for bodily injury against the city related to the specified incident. The city does not affirmatively represent to this office the claim letter is in compliance with the TTCA. Therefore, we will only consider the claim as a factor in determining whether the city reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Based on the representations of the city, our review of the submitted documents, and the totality of circumstances, we find the city has demonstrated it reasonably anticipated litigation on the date the city received the request for information. We also find the city has established the submitted information is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). Therefore, the city may withhold the responsive information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

However, once the information has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation, 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 has 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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CVMS/be

---

<sup>3</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of the submitted information.

Ref: ID# 799643

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)