



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 24, 2022

Ms. Roxann Pais Cotroneo
City Attorney
City of Aransas Pass
600 West Cleveland Boulevard
Aransas Pass, Texas 78336

OR2022-32744

Dear Ms. Cotroneo:

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# 980164.

The City of Aransas Pass (the "city") received a request for all e-mails involving named individuals discussing specified topics during a specified time period. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exception you claim 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 employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

¹ Although you also raise section 552.111 of the Government Code, you make no arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn your claim that this section applies to the submitted information. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

...

(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 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is 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. *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). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a).

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *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. *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). 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 provide documentation showing, misdemeanor cases were pending before the city's municipal court when you received the request for information. We understand you to object to release of the information at issue as a representative of the city's municipal prosecutor. Upon review, we agree litigation was pending when the city received the request, and the information is related to the pending litigation. In addition, you assert the city reasonably anticipated civil litigation prior receipt of the present request for information. You state, and provide documentation demonstrating, prior to the city's receipt of the present request, the requestor made claims of alleged constitutional violations by the city and indicated he would file suit if specific demands were not met. You also state the information at issue pertains to the subject matter of the anticipated litigation. Based on your representations, our review of the information, and the totality of the circumstances, we find the city reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the present request for information, and the information at issue relates to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Accordingly, the city may generally withhold the submitted information under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.

We note, however, the opposing party has seen or had access to some of the information at issue. The purpose of section 552.103 of the Government Code is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties seeking information relating to the litigation to obtain such information through discovery procedures. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5. Thus, once the opposing party to the pending or anticipated litigation has seen or had access to information that is related to the litigation, there is no interest in withholding such information from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Therefore, the city may not withhold the information seen by the opposing party, which we have indicated, under section 552.103. Accordingly, with the exception of the information we have indicated, which must be released to this requestor, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.² We note the applicability of section 552.103 ends once the related litigation concludes. *See* 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.

² We note the information being released contains an e-mail address to which the requestor has a right of access under section 552.137(b) of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(b). However, Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) is a previous determination authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold specific categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision, including e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code. Thus, if the city receives another request for this same information from a person who does not have a right of access to it, Open Records Decision No. 684 authorizes the city to redact the requestor's e-mail address without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

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/jxd

Ref: ID# 980164

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)