



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 9, 2020

Mr. J. Eric Magee
Counsel for the Victoria County Sheriff's Office
Allison, Bass & Magee, L.L.P
402 West 12th Street
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2020-00943

Dear Mr. Magee:

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# 805428.

The Victoria County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions 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).

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 litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” *Id.* We note the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983). This office has concluded, when a governmental body receives a notice of claim letter, it can meet its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated by representing the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act (the “TTCA”), Civil Practice and Remedies Code chapter 101, or an applicable municipal ordinance. Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996).

You state, and provide documentation demonstrating, prior to the date the sheriff's office received the instant request for information, the sheriff's office received a notice of claim from an attorney, whose client's son was killed in the incident at issue, claiming injuries and damages in connection with the specified accident. You do not affirmatively represent to this office the notice of claim complies with the TTCA or an applicable ordinance; therefore, we will only consider the notice of claim as a factor in determining whether the sheriff's office reasonably anticipated litigation over the incident in question. Nevertheless, based on these representations, our review of the submitted information, and the totality of the circumstances, we determine the sheriff's office has established it reasonably anticipated litigation prior to the date it received the request for information. We further find Tab 3 is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Accordingly, we conclude the sheriff's office may generally withhold Tab 3 under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

However, we note information normally found on the front page of an offense or incident report is generally considered public. *Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976); *see* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976). This office has stated basic information about a crime may not be withheld under section 552.103 even if it is related to the litigation. Open Records Decision No. 362 (1983). Thus, we find the basic offense information from the incident report may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.103. Therefore, with the exception of basic information, which must be

released, the sheriff's office may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103(a).¹

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. *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 or anticipated 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 been 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,



Pearlie Gault
Attorney
Open Records Division

PG/eb

Ref: ID# 805428

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.