



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 14, 2022

Mr. Cory Scanlon
General Counsel
Texas Veterans Commission
P.O. Box 12277
Austin, Texas 78711-2277

OR2022-38699

Dear Mr. Scanlon:

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# 989857 (Ref. No. 2022-19).

The Texas Veterans Commission (the “commission”) received a request for nine categories of information pertaining to communications involving named individuals and the requestor’s company.¹ You state the commission does not have information responsive to portions of the request.² You also state the commission has released some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information, a portion of which constitutes a representative sample.³

¹ You state the commission 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).

² The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request, create responsive information, or obtain information that is not held by the governmental body or on its behalf. *See Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 555 at 1 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

³ 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

Initially, the commission asserts some of the submitted information is not responsive to the instant request for information. However, we note the information at issue is located within documents that were specifically requested; thus, we find this information is responsive to the instant request. Upon review, we find all of the submitted information is responsive to the instant request. We will therefore address the commission's claimed exceptions to disclosure of the entirety of the submitted information.

Next, we note you have redacted portions of the submitted information. Pursuant to section 552.301 of the Government Code, a governmental body that seeks to withhold requested information must submit to this office a copy of the information, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the copy, unless the governmental body has received a previous determination for the information at issue. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a), (e)(1)(D). You do not assert, nor does our review of the records indicate, the district has been authorized to withhold this information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See id.* § 552.301(a); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a) of the Government Code). As such, information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether the information comes within the scope of an exception to disclosure. In this instance, we are unable to discern the nature of the redacted information. Consequently, the commission has failed to comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code as to this information, and this information is presumed public under section 552.302 of the Government Code. Accordingly, the commission must release the redacted information pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code.

Next, we note some of the information at issue is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

[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 information at issue includes a completed evaluation and completed investigation that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The commission must release the completed investigation pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(1). The information at issue also includes information in an account, contract, or voucher relating to the receipt or

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.

expenditure of funds by the commission that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3) of Government Code. This information must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(3). The commission seeks 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 commission may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, because section 552.117 of the Government Code can make information confidential for purposes of section 552.022, we will consider the applicability of this exception to the information at issue.⁴ Additionally, we will consider the commission’s argument under section 552.103 for the information not subject to section 552.022.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 434.0205 of the Government Code, which provides as follows: “Any information provided by a person to the commission to receive services or participate in commission programs is confidential and not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552.” *Id.* § 434.0205. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue was provided by a person to the commission to receive services or participate in commission programs. Therefore, section 434.0205 is not applicable to the information at issue and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 on this basis.

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.

⁴ The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Id. § 552.103(a), (c). The 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. *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 parts of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with “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 that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body’s receipt of a letter, prior to its receipt of a request for information, containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. ORD 555; *see* 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. 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 the context of anticipated litigation in which the governmental body is the prospective plaintiff, the concrete evidence must at least reflect that litigation is “realistically contemplated.” *See* ORD 518 at 5; *see also* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982) (finding that investigatory file may be withheld from disclosure if governmental body attorney determines that it should be withheld pursuant to section 552.103 and that litigation is “reasonably likely to result”). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. ORD 452 at 4.

Although you assert section 552.103, upon review, we find the commission has not established litigation involving the commission as a party was pending on the date the commission received the present request. Further, we find the commission has failed to demonstrate it reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the request for information. Therefore, the commission may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(1). We note, for purposes of section 552.117, “family member” means a spouse, minor child, or adult child who resides in the person’s home. *See id.* § 552.117(c) (providing that “family member” has meaning assigned by Fin. Code § 31.006(d)). We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal

cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, to the extent the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the commission must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone number may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. Conversely, to the extent the individual at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1).

In summary, the commission must release the redacted information pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code. To the extent the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the commission must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone number may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. The commission must release the remaining information.

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,

Sarah E. Reese
Attorney
Open Records Division

SER/jxd

Mr. Cory Scanlon - Page 6

Ref: ID# 989857

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)