



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 6, 2022

Ms. Becky N. Rangel  
Legal Operation Specialist  
Humble Independent School District  
10203 Birchridge Drive  
Humble, Texas 77338

OR2022-30777

Dear Ms. Rangel:

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# 973329 (ORR No. 071122-02).

The Humble Independent School District (the "district") received a request for e-mails between named individuals and entities.<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</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

---

<sup>1</sup> You state the district sought and received clarification of the request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (stating if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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 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 "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 ORD 518 at 5 (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).* 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).*

This office has long held that "litigation," for purposes of section 552.103, includes "contested cases" conducted in a quasi-judicial forum. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 474 (1987), 368 (1983), 336 (1982), 301 (1982).* In determining whether an administrative proceeding is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum, some of the factors this office considers are whether the administrative proceeding provides for discovery, evidence to be heard, factual questions to be resolved, the making of a record, and whether the proceeding is an adjudicative forum of first jurisdiction with appellate review of the resulting decision without a re-adjudication of fact questions. *See Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991).*

You inform us, that prior to the district's receipt of the clarified request for information, the requestor filed a grievance with the district. You explain that grievances filed with the district are "litigation" because the district follows administrative procedures in handling such disputes. You state the district's grievance process is a multi-level hearing process before various administrators and the district's Board of Trustees. Based upon these representations and our review of the information at issue, we find you have demonstrated the district's administrative procedure for disputes is conducted in a quasi-judicial forum and, thus, constitutes litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Therefore, we determine the district was involved in litigation at the time it received the instant request. We also find that the information at issue is related to the pending litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Thus, the district 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. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing parties is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); 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,

Cesar Mata  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

CM/eb

Ref: ID# 973329

c: Requestor

---

<sup>3</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.