



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 13, 2020

Mr. Trent C. Rowell
Assistant County Attorney
Atascosa County
1 Courthouse Circle Drive, #3-B
Jourdanton, Texas 78026

OR2020-10770

Dear Mr. Rowell:

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# 821810.

The County of Atascosa (the "county") received a request for budget, contract, and animal transport records pertaining to the county's animal control for a specified period of time. You state the county does not possess some information.¹ 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.

Initially, we note you have only submitted an animal transport record. Thus, although you state the county has submitted a representative sample of the requested information, we find the submitted information is not representative of all the information to which the requestor seeks access. Please be advised this open records letter ruling applies only to the type of information you have submitted for our review. This ruling does not authorize the county to withhold any type of information that is substantially different from the types of information you submitted to this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302 (where request for attorney general decision does not comply with requirements of section 552.301, information at issue is presumed to be public). Therefore, we presume the county has released the information responsive to the remaining portions of the request, to the extent

¹ The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *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).

such information existed when the city received this request for information. If not, then the county must release any such information immediately. *See id.* §§ 552.221, .301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000).

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

(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 claiming section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of section 552.103 to the information it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate: (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of 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 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated for the purposes of section 552.103, a governmental body must provide this office with "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." *See* 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 litigation is "realistically contemplated." *See* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989); *see also* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982) (finding investigatory file may be withheld if governmental body attorney determines it should be withheld pursuant to section 552.103 and 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 state the submitted information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code. You inform us the information at issue relates to a contract between the county and two individuals. You state, at the time of the request, the county anticipated filing a civil lawsuit against the individuals for breach of contract and fraud. Based on these representations and our review of the information at issue, we

conclude litigation was reasonably anticipated on the date the county received the present request for information. Further, we find the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Therefore, the county may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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,

Paige Lay
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PL/mo

Ref: ID# 821810

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)