



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 1, 2022

Mr. William W. Webster  
Senior Associate General Counsel  
Texas Tech University System  
P.O. Box 42021  
Lubbock, Texas 79409-2021

OR2022-26672

Dear Mr. Webster:

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# 967248.

The Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center El Paso (the "university") received three requests from two requestors for e-mails sent to for from named employees during specified time periods that pertain to two specified key words, a specified topic, or the first requestor. The university states it does not have information pertaining to first request.<sup>1</sup> The university also states it has redacted student-identifying information from the submitted documents pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.<sup>2</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code.

---

<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 266 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

<sup>2</sup> The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office FERPA does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental or student consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act. The DOE has determined FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/files/divisions/open-government/20060725-USDOE-FERPA.pdf>.

We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>3</sup>

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 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).*

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

---

<sup>3</sup> 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

<sup>4</sup> In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982)*; hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982)*; and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).*

Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). On the other hand, this office has determined that 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 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, prior to the date the university received the instant requests, the first requestor’s attorney sent a letter to the university asserting allegations of discrimination against the university pertaining to the first requestor. Additionally, you state, and provide documentation showing, prior to the date the university received the present requests, the first requestor provided a letter to the university stating she intends to commence a lawsuit against the university and named university employees and officials. In the letter, the first requestor seeks monetary damages and alleges, among other actions, violation of due process under the Fourteenth Amendment, deprivation of freedom of speech under the First Amendment, discrimination under Section 501 of Rehabilitation Act, retaliation under Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and negligent infliction of emotional distress. Based upon your representations and our review of the information at issue, we determine you have established the university reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the present requests for information. Further, we find the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation. Accordingly, the university may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.<sup>5</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

---

<sup>5</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Mr. William Webster - Page 4

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,

Jennifer Copeland  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JC/jm

Ref: ID# 967248

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)