



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 1, 2020

Ms. Erin J. Onyon  
Director of Public Records & Transparency Compliance  
City of Mansfield  
1200 East Broad Street  
Mansfield, Texas 76063

OR2020-29845

Dear Ms. Onyon:

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# 856113 (File No. 1217-2020).

The City of Mansfield (the "city") received a request for resumes submitted by twenty-nine named city police department employees. You state the city does not have information responsive to portions of the request.<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 and 552.117 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> We note the Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the governmental body received the request for information. *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); Open Records Decision Nos. 452 at 2-3 (1986), 342 at 3 (1982), 87 (1975); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 572 at 1 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 416 at 5 (1984).

<sup>2</sup> Although you claim section 552.1175 of the Government Code for portions of the submitted information, section 552.117 is the proper exception to raise in this instance because the city holds the submitted information in an employment capacity.

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).*

You state, and provide documentation showing, prior to your receipt of the instant request, a lawsuit styled *Mason v. City of Mansfield*, Cause No. 3:20-cv-02061-N-BK, was filed and is currently pending against the city in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, Fort Worth Division. Therefore, we agree litigation was pending on the date the city received the present request for information. You also state the information at issue pertains to the substance of the lawsuit claims. Based on these representations and our review, we find the information at issue is related to the pending litigation. Therefore, we conclude the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

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 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.

---

<sup>3</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.

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,

Tim Neal  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TN/be

Ref: ID# 856113

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)