



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 16, 2022

Ms. Raika Rowe  
Counsel for the City of Pflugerville  
Denton Navarro Rocha Bernal & Zech, P.C.  
2500 West William Cannon Drive, Suite 609  
Austin, Texas 78745-5320

OR2022-28561

Dear Ms. Rowe:

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# 969980 (COP Request IDs W014347, W014348, and W014349).

The City of Pflugerville (the "city"), which you represent, received three requests from the same requestor for several categories of personnel records pertaining to the requestor and certain testing records. You state the city has released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.111, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you inform us the city wishes to withdraw its request for an open records decision with respect to the information responsive to one of the requests because the requestor has voluntarily withdrawn that request for information. This ruling does not address the public availability of information the requestor no longer seeks.

Initially, 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:

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

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body [.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1), (3). The submitted information includes completed evaluations that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the completed evaluations pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless they are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information also contains information in an account, contract, or voucher relating to the receipt or expenditure of funds by the city that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3). This information must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(3). You seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, section 552.103 is discretionary in nature 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); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the information we have marked may not be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code, and the city must release it pursuant to section 552.022 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 (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 litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter and the governmental body represents the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act (“TTCA”), Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code, ch. 101. If a governmental body does not make this representation, the claim letter is a factor that this office will consider in determining whether a governmental body has established litigation is reasonably anticipated based on the totality of the circumstances. 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 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 claim the city reasonably anticipated litigation with respect to the underlying incident at issue and the remaining information is related to that litigation. Based on your representations, our review of the information at issue, and the totality of the circumstances, we find the city reasonably anticipated litigation as of the date it received the request for information. We further find the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Accordingly, we conclude the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>1</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

---

<sup>1</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of the remaining 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 concluded. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, the city must release the information we have marked pursuant 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,

Gerald A. Arismendez  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

GAA/eb

Ref: ID# 969980

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)