



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 31, 2019

Mr. Evaristo Garcia, Jr.  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of McAllen  
P.O. Box 220  
McAllen, Texas 78505-0220

OR2019-36571

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# 803937 (ORR# W029156-100419).

The City of McAllen (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to building inspections for a specified period of time. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the city only submitted notes regarding the requestor. We assume, to the extent any additional responsive information existed when the city received the request for information, the city has released it. If not, then the city must do so immediately. *See Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000).*

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 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 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).

This office has long held that for the purposes of section 552.103, “litigation” includes “contested cases” conducted in a quasi-judicial forum. See Open Records Decision Nos. 474 (1987), 368 (1983), 336 (1982), 301 (1982). Likewise, “contested cases” conducted under the Texas Administrative Procedure Act, chapter 2001 of the Government Code, constitute “litigation” for purposes of section 552.103. See Open Records Decision Nos. 588 (1991) (concerning former State Board of Insurance proceeding), 301 (concerning hearing before Public Utilities Commission). In determining whether an administrative proceeding is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum, some of the factors this office considers are whether the administrative proceeding provides for discovery, evidence to be heard, factual questions to be resolved, the making of a record, and whether the proceeding is an adjudicative forum of first jurisdiction with appellate review of the resulting decision without a re-adjudication of fact questions. See ORD 588.

The city states prior to the date it received the present request for information, the requestor filed an appeal of disciplinary action taken against him by the city in accordance with the city's disciplinary and grievance procedures. The city asserts the appeal hearings are conducted in a quasi-judicial forum. The city explains, during the hearing, “(1) evidence is heard; (2) witnesses are presented; (3) factual issues are resolved; (4) a record is made; ([5]) the employee may retain and be represented by an attorney; [and] ([6]) a determination is made to affirm, modify, or reverse any adverse disciplinary action[.]” The city also explains the appeal hearing “is an adjudicative forum of first jurisdiction in that an employee must exhaust his/her administrative remedies before they may pursue a complaint and Charge of Discrimination with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (‘EEOC’), the Texas Workforce Commission’s Civil Rights Division (‘CRD’), and file a lawsuit with a court.” Further, the city informs us “the determination of the [c]ity [m]anager in disciplinary appeal matters triggers deadlines for the affected employees,” and the requestor “currently remains within the statutory timeframe to pursue a complaint and Charge of Discrimination with the EEOC, CRD and file a lawsuit with a court.” Based on the city's representations and our review, we find the city has demonstrated this appeals process is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum and, thus, constitutes litigation for purposes


of section 552.103. Accordingly, we determine the city was involved in pending litigation at the time it received the instant request. The city states the submitted information directly relates to the subject of this pending litigation. Based on the city's representations and our review, we find the information at issue is related to the pending litigation. Therefore, we conclude the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup>

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation though 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 pending 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 <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,



James L. Coggeshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLC/mo

Ref: ID# 803937

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>1</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address the other argument of the city to withhold this information.