



Office of the Attorney General
State of Texas

DAN MORALES
ATTORNEY GENERAL

October 14, 1997

Ms. J. Middlebrooks
Assistant City Attorney
Criminal Law and Police Division
2014 Main, Room 501
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR97-2287

Dear Ms. Middlebrooks:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 109619.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for the complete personnel file of a city employee including all disciplinary actions taken against her. You claim that the requested documents may be withheld from required public disclosure by sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.108, and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and have reviewed the documents at issue.

When asserting section 552.103(a), a governmental body must establish that the requested information relates to pending or reasonably anticipated litigation.¹ Thus, under section 552.103(a) a governmental body's burden is two-pronged. The governmental body must establish that (1) litigation is either pending or reasonably anticipated, and that (2) the requested information relates to that litigation. *See 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 (1990) at 4.

¹552.103(a) excepts from required public disclosure information:

(1) relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature or settlement negotiations, 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; and

(2) that the attorney general or the attorney of the political subdivision has determined should be withheld from public inspection.

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 (1986) at 4. 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.² Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 (1989) at 5 (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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Nor does the mere fact that an individual hires an attorney and alleges damages serve to establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983) at 2. Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 452 (1986) at 4.

You explain that the Dallas Police Department's Public Integrity Unit is currently investigating a city employee for an alleged criminal assault which occurred at the Detox Center. You state that the "Public Integrity Unit will eventually present its investigation of the alleged official oppression before the Dallas County Grand Jury." You have shown that the alleged victim of the assault has hired an attorney and has sent a notice of claim to the city alleging damages. Under these circumstances, we find that litigation is reasonably anticipated and that the requested documents relate to the anticipated litigation. You may withhold the requested information under section 552.103. We note, however, that information normally found on the front page of an offense report is generally considered public. *Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976); Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976). Thus, you must release the type of information that is considered to be front page offense report information, even if this information is not actually located on the front page of the offense report. *See Houston Chronicle*, 531 S.W.2d at 187; *cf.* Open Records Decision No. 597 (1991) (basic information in an offense report generally may not be withheld under section 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing the types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*).

We also note that once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, generally, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information

²In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

Because we make a determination under section 552.103, we do not address your additional arguments against disclosure at this time. We are resolving this matter with an informal letter ruling rather than with a published open records decision. This ruling is limited to the particular records at issue under the facts presented to us in this request and should not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records. If you have questions about this ruling, please contact our office.

Yours very truly,



Don Ballard
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JDB/ch

Ref: ID# 109619

Enclosures: Submitted documents

cc: Ms. Kay Vinson
I-Team Producer
400 N. Griffin Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
(w/o enclosures)

