



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 14, 2020

Ms. Linda Pemberton
Paralegal
City of Killeen
P.O. Box 1329
Killeen, Texas 76540

OR2020-20494

Dear Ms. Pemberton:

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# 839821 (Request ID#s W032291, W03441, & W03442).

The Killeen Police Department (the "department") received three requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to two specified case numbers and information pertaining to no-knock warrants from a specified time period. 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 representative sample of information.¹

Initially, the department states some of the submitted information was the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2019-14219 (2019). In that ruling, we determined with the exception of basic information, the department may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. You state there has been no change in the law, facts, or circumstances on which the previous ruling was based. Accordingly, to the extent the submitted information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, the department may rely on Open Records Letter No. 2019-14219 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and

¹ 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.

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 some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) 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:

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). The submitted information includes a court-filed document that is subject to section 552.022(a)(17). This information must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(17). The department seeks to withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a) under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Although you assert the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code, this section is discretionary 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 section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the department may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022, which we have marked, under section 552.103. As you raise no other exceptions for this information, it must be released.

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, prior to the date you received the instant request for information, the department received a demand letter seeking damages for the wrongful death of a named individual resulting from a no-knock raid executed by the department. You affirmatively state the demand letter meets the requirements of the TTCA. Thus, we find the department reasonably anticipated litigation related to the matter at issue. You further state the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation. Based on these representations and our review, we find the information at issue is related to litigation that was reasonably anticipated on the date the department received the request for information. Therefore, the department may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

However, the information at issue involves alleged criminal activity. We note 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 includes, among other items, a detailed description of the offense

and the identities of the complainants, but does not include dates of birth or motor vehicle record information encompassed by section 552.130 of the Government Code. *See* ORD 127 at 3-4.

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 pending or 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).

In summary, the department must release the information we marked pursuant to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. With the exception of the basic information, the department 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,

Pearlie Gault
Attorney
Open Records Division

PG/jm

Ref: ID# 839821

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)