



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 19, 2020

Ms. Nancy Gonzalez
Open Records Coordinator
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla Street, Suite 5DS
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2020-05158

Dear Ms. Gonzalez:

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# 812306 (ORR# C010849-112019).

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified accident and claim number.¹ You state the city will release some of the requested information. You also state the city will redact social security numbers under section 552.147(b) of the Government Code and information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).² Further, you state the city will redact dates of birth pursuant to Open Records Letter No. 2017-09757 (2017).³ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have

¹ The city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (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) (if governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or over-broad request, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified).

² Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination issued by this office authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

³ Open Records Letter No. 2017-09757 is a previous determination issued to the city authorizing it to withhold the dates of birth of city employees under section 552.102 of the Government Code and the dates of birth of public citizens under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without seeking a ruling from this office. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a) of the Government Code).

considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.⁴

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). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show section 552.103(a) 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. *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). 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 the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Id.* In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated a governmental body has met its burden of showing litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter, and the governmental body represents the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act, Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code, ch. 101, or an applicable municipal ordinance.

You state, and submit documentation showing, prior to the city's receipt of the instant request, the city received a notice of claim letter from the requestor's client, the complainant

⁴ We assume that 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.

in the incident at issue. You state the notice of claim letter meets the requirements of Chapter XXIII of the Dallas City Charter, which requires written notice before any claim for injury or damage may be considered by the city. You state, and we agree, the submitted information is directly related to the subject matter of the anticipated litigation. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the submitted information is related to litigation reasonably anticipated at the time the city received the request for information. Therefore, we find the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.⁵

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 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,



Emily Kunst
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EK/be

Ref: ID# 812306

c: Requestor

⁵ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.