



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 22, 2022

Ms. Audrea Hutson  
Open Records  
Williamson County Sheriff's Office  
508 South Rock Street  
Georgetown, Texas 78626

OR2022-11728

Dear Ms. Hutson:

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# 943033.

The Williamson County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office") received two requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to a specified incident involving the requestor's client. You state the sheriff's office will redact dates of birth of members of the public pursuant to the previous determination issued in Open Records Letter No. 2016-21706 (2016).<sup>1</sup> You claim some of the submitted information was not properly requested pursuant to section 1701.661 of the Occupations Code. You also claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Open Records Letter No. 2016-21706 authorizes the sheriff's office to withhold dates of birth of members of the public under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

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.

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.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter, prior to its receipt of a request for information, containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). 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 present documentation demonstrating, prior to receipt of the instant requests for information, the sheriff's office received a notice of claim letter alleging "extensive and ongoing" damages as a result of the specified incident. You do not affirmatively represent to this office the notice of claim letter complies with the TTCA; thus, we will only consider the notice of claim letter as a factor in determining whether the sheriff's office reasonably anticipated litigation pertaining to the incident at issue. Nevertheless, based upon your

representations, our review of the information at issue, and the totality of the circumstances, we determine you have established the sheriff's office reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the instant requests for information. You also state, and we agree, the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103 of the Government Code. Accordingly, the sheriff's office may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>2</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 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).

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,

Alexandra C. Burks  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ACB/jm

Ref: ID# 943033

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>2</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information. Further, as we are able to make this determination, we do not address the applicability of section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code to the submitted video recordings. *See generally* Occ. Code § 1701.661(a), (e).