



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 23, 2020

Ms. Laurie Nichols
Paralegal
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla Street, Suite 7DN
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2020-11659

Dear Ms. Green:

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# 823927 (ORR Nos. C001213 and C001297).

The City of Dallas (the "city") received two requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to two specified requests for proposals, including communications during a specified time period.¹ You state the city will release some information. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.104, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state the release of some of the remaining information may implicate the proprietary interests of Oldcastle Materials Texas, Inc. d/b/a TexasBit; Reverchon Park Sports and Entertainment, L.L.C.; Reverchon Sports and Entertainment, L.L.C.; and Ventura Sports Group. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, the city notified these third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability

¹ You state the city 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).

of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Initially, you inform us some of the submitted information was the subject of a previous request for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2020-11050 (2020). In that ruling, we determined the city must release the submitted information. We have no indication the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have changed. Therefore, the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2020-11050 as a previous determination and release the information previously requested and ruled upon in accordance with that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure).

Next, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from any of the third parties explaining why the information at issue should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of these third parties have a protected proprietary interest in this information. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information on the basis of any proprietary interest the third parties may have in the information.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides 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

² 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.

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 the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (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. *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).

You state, and provide documentation showing, a lawsuit styled *Barner v. City of Dallas*, Cause No. DC-20-02101, was pending against the city in the Dallas County District Court when it received the instant requests for information. You state the remaining information is related to the pending lawsuit. Based on your representations, the submitted documentation, and our review of the information at issue, we find litigation was pending when the city received the requests for information, and the information at issue is related to the pending litigation for the purposes of section 552.103. Therefore, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.³

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. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing parties in the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2020-11050 as a previous determination and release the information previously requested and ruled upon in accordance with that ruling. The city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.

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->

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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,

Kieran Hillis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KH/gw

Ref: ID# 823927

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

4 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)