



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 14, 2022

Ms. Barbara Boulware-Wells
Counsel for the City of Sunset Valley
The Knight Law Firm
223 West Anderson Lane, Suite A-105
Austin, Texas 78752

OR2022-38919

Dear Ms. Boulware-Wells:

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# 989854 (PIR 830).

The City of Sunset Valley (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for specified personnel records pertaining to named city employees. You state you have released some information. 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.

Initially, we note the requestor excluded certain types of information from the scope of the request, including home addresses, home telephone numbers, social security numbers, and driver's license numbers. Accordingly, these types of information are not responsive to the request for information, which you marked. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the city is not required to release that information in response to the request.

Next, we note some of the responsive 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[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The responsive 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 city 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 information we 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:

(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). The governmental body claiming section 552.103 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).

The city states, and provides documentation showing, prior to its receipt of the instant request, a lawsuit styled *Wilson v. City of Sunset Valley*, Cause No. D-1-GN-21-002813,

was filed and is currently pending against the city in the 53rd Judicial District Court of Travis County, Texas. Therefore, we agree litigation was pending on the date the city received the present request for information. The city also states the information at issue pertains to the substance of the lawsuit claims. Based on these representations and our review, we find the information at issue is related to the pending litigation. Therefore, we conclude the city may withhold the remaining responsive information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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 that has either been obtained from or provided to all parties to the pending 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 been concluded. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, the city must release the completed evaluations we marked pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the remaining responsive 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,

D. Michelle Case
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DMH/pt

Ref: ID# 989854

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)