



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 13, 2004

Ms. Laura Shackelford
Assistant General Counsel
State Bar of Texas
P. O. Box 12487
Austin, Texas 78711-2487

OR2004-2972

Dear Ms. Shackelford:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 199176.

The State Bar of Texas (the "bar") received a request for nine categories of financial and other information related to the upgrade or modification of any bar sponsored or affiliated website for a specified period of time. You claim that the requested information, or portions thereof, is excepted from disclosure pursuant to sections 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.136 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and have reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that portions of the submitted information are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides that:

the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

...

(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)(3). The submitted information includes information that is encompassed by section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code. Thus, the bar must release the information that is subject to subsection 552.022(a)(3), unless it is expressly confidential

under other law. Although the bar claims that the information that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3) is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code, we note that section 552.103 is a discretionary exception to disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act") that does not constitute "other law" for the purposes of section 552.022.¹ Accordingly, we conclude that the bar may not withhold any portion of the information that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3), which we have marked, under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, since the bar also claims that portions of this particular information are excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code, we will address this claim.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides:

(a) In this section, "access device" means a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to:

- (1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value; or
- (2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.

Gov't Code § 552.136. Accordingly, we conclude that the bar must withhold the information that we have marked within the information that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3) pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code. The bar must release to the requestor the remaining portions of the information that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code.

¹ Discretionary exceptions are intended to protect only the interests of the governmental body, as distinct from exceptions which are intended to protect information deemed confidential by law or the interests of third parties. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 4 (1994) (governmental body may waive attorney-client privilege, section 552.107(1)), 551 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 serves only to protect governmental body's position in litigation and does not itself make information confidential), 522 at 4 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general), 473 (1987) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.111); *see also 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 section 552.103). Discretionary exceptions, therefore, do not constitute "other law" that makes information confidential.

Next, we address your section 552.103 claim with regard to the remaining submitted information. Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in 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 bar maintains the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of section 552.103 to the information that it seeks to withhold from disclosure. To meet this burden, the bar must demonstrate: (1) that litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information and (2) that the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App. – Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App. – Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103.

In demonstrating that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the bar must furnish concrete evidence that litigation is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *See* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989). 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 *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). Conversely, 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). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for

² In 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).

information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986).

You indicate that litigation against the bar is realistically contemplated regarding the subject matter of the request for information by stating, and providing documentation showing, that the requestor as an attorney has made specific threats to sue the bar regarding the subject matter of this request. Based on our review of your arguments and the remaining submitted information, we find that the bar has adequately demonstrated that it reasonably anticipated litigation with regard to the subject matter of the request on the date that it received the request for information and that the remaining submitted information relates to that anticipated litigation. Accordingly, we conclude that the bar may withhold the remaining submitted information pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code.

However, we note that 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 the potential opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and may not be withheld from the requestor on that basis. We further note that the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded.³ *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, with the exception of the marked information that must be withheld pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code, the bar must release the information that we have marked pursuant to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code. The bar may withhold the remaining submitted information pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the

³ Because we base our ruling regarding the remaining submitted information on section 552.103 of the Government Code, we need not address your remaining claimed exceptions to disclosure.

governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).


If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Ronald J. Bounds
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RJB/lmt

Ref: ID# 199176

Enc. Marked documents

c: Mr. James C. Harrington
Director
Texas Civil Rights Project
1405 Montopolis Drive
Austin, Texas 78741-3438
(w/o enclosures)