



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 28, 2020

Mr. Leonard Schneider
Counsel for the City of Huntsville
Liles Parker, P.L.L.C.
2261 Northpark Drive, Suite 445
Kingwood, Texas 77339

OR2020-18761

Dear Mr. Schneider:

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# 838520 (ORR# 6061).

The City of Huntsville (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for e-mails between the requestor and a named individual during a specified time period. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exception the city claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in 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.

...

¹ Although the city also raises section 552.101 of the Government Code, the city has not provided any arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we assume the city has withdrawn its claim this section applies to the submitted information. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

(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 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).

Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. See Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” *Id.*

This office has stated a pending complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission indicates litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision Nos. 386 at 2 (1983), 336 at 1 (1982). The city states, and provides documentation demonstrating, prior to receipt of the instant request for information, the requestor filed a complaint against the city with the Texas Workforce Commission Civil Rights Division. Upon review, we find the city has demonstrated litigation was reasonably anticipated when the city received the request for information. Further, the city states the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). Therefore, we agree the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

However, we note once the information has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision No. 349 at 2 (1982). We also note the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends when the litigation has concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982) at 2; Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2.

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,

Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/be

Ref: ID# 838520

c: Requestor