



Office of the Attorney General  
State of Texas

June 29, 1993

DAN MORALES  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

Ms. Laura S. Portwood  
City of Houston  
Legal Department  
P.O. Box 1562  
Houston, Texas 77251-1562

OR93-357

Dear Ms. Portwood:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Texas Open Records Act, article 6252-17a, V.T.C.S. Your request was assigned ID# 20180.


The City of Houston (the "city") has received two requests for information relating to a city police department sergeant's promotional examination. Specifically, the requestors seek their rankings on the promotional examination. You contend that the requested information may be withheld from the public pursuant to section 3(a)(3) of the Open Records Act. To secure the protection of section 3(a)(3), a governmental body must demonstrate that requested information "relates" to a pending or reasonably anticipated judicial or quasi-judicial proceeding. Open Records Decision No. 551 (1990). In this instance you have made the requisite showing that the requested information relates to pending litigation for purposes of section 3(a)(3); the requested records may therefore be withheld. *See also* Open Records Letter OR93-295 (1993) (discussion of same matter).

In reaching this conclusion, however, we assume that the opposing party to the litigation has not previously had access to the records at issue; absent special circumstances, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation, *e.g.*, through discovery or otherwise, no section 3(a)(3) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349, 320 (1982). If the opposing parties in the litigation have seen or had access to any of the information in these records, there would be no justification for now withholding that information from the requestor pursuant to section 3(a)(3).

We also note that because section 3(a)(3) protects only information that is relevant to the litigation, this section is inapplicable to documents that the presiding judge has ruled undiscoverable because they lack relevance to the lawsuit. In addition, the applicability of section 3(a)(3) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

Because case law and prior published open records decisions resolve your request, we are resolving this matter with this informal letter ruling rather than with a published open records decision. If you have questions about this ruling, please contact this office.

Yours very truly,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "William Walker", written in a cursive style.

William Walker  
Assistant Attorney General  
Opinion Committee

WMW/GCK/jmn

Ref.: ID# 20180

cc: Mr. Rogelio Rodriguez  
15343 Waxwing Park Drive  
Humble, Texas 77096

Mr. James T. Howard  
15319 East Chaparral  
Baytown, Texas 77520