



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 15, 2022

Mr. Bryan J. Guymon  
Counsel for the City of Friona  
Underwood Law Firm, P.C.  
P.O. Box 662  
Pampa, Texas 79066-0662

OR2022-35612

Dear Mr. Guymon:

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# 985222.

The Friona Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for twenty-four categories of information related to a specified incident. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. 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.

...

(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.

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 that 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. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). 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 that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983). 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, or an applicable municipal ordinance.

You state the department received a communication indicating the department would receive a notice of claim related to the specified incident. You represent the notice of claim letter complies with the notice requirements of the TTCA. However, we note the communication at issue was received by the department after the date the department received the instant request for information. Further, you have not provided this office with evidence anyone had taken any objective steps toward filing a lawsuit prior to the date the department received the request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e); ORD 331. Accordingly, we find you have failed to demonstrate the department reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the instant request for information. Therefore, the department may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s or driver’s license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. We note, because section 552.130 protects privacy

interests, the requestor has a right of access to his clients' motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.023(a) (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access to records that contain information relating to the person that are protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Accordingly, the department must withhold all visible license plates not belonging to the requestor's clients within the submitted video recordings under section 552.130 of the Government Code. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, the department must release the remaining information to this requestor.<sup>1</sup>

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,

Tim Neal  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TN/pt

Ref: ID# 985222

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>1</sup> As previously noted, the requestor has a right of access to his clients' motor vehicle record information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. If the department receives another request for this information from an individual without such a right of access, we note section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to react the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 553.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e).