



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 11, 2020

Mr. Eric C. Farrar  
Counsel for the City of Jersey Village  
Olson & Olson, LLP  
2727 Allen Parkway, Suite 600  
Houston, Texas 77019-2133

OR2020-19962

Dear Mr. Farrar:

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# 838997 (Ref. No. JV20-117).

The City of Jersey Village (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for specified records involving two named officers. You state the city will redact certain information pursuant to section 552.136(c) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> 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.

Section 552.022(a) of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information includes a completed report that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release this information, which we marked, pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See id.* § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e).

section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. Although you raise section 552.103 of the Government Code for the submitted information, this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive Gov't Code § 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver discretionary exceptions). Therefore, none of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) may be withheld under section 552.103. However, we will consider your argument under section 552.103 for the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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 that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, or when an individual threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an

attorney. See Open Records Decision Nos. 346 (1982), 288 (1981). In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated a governmental body has met its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter and the governmental body represents that the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act (“TTCA”), Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code, ch. 101. On the other hand, this office has determined if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. See Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish litigation is reasonably anticipated. See Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You state, and provide documentation showing, the city received a notice of representation and a draft petition alleging wrongful termination from the requestor’s attorney prior to the receipt of the instant request for information. Based upon your representations and our review of the information at issue, we determine you established the city reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the instant request for information. Further, we find the remaining information is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Accordingly, the city may generally withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

However, the information at issue involves alleged criminal activity. As you acknowledge, 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 of the Government Code even if it is related to the litigation. Open Records Decision No. 362 (1983). We note basic information does not include dates of birth or motor vehicle record information under section 552.130 of the Government Code. See ORD 127 at 3-4. Thus, we find the basic offense information from the call for service report may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation though 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 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).

In summary, with the exception of basic information and the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 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-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,

Katie Stallcup  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

AKS/rm

Ref: ID# 838997

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)