ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 26, 2004

Mr. Steven D. Monté
Assistant City Attorney
Criminal Law & Police Division
City of Dallas
1400 South Lamar Street #300A
Dallas, Texas 75215-1801

OR2004-3383

Dear Mr. Monté:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 199983.

The Dallas Police Department (the "department") received a request for various types of information relating to the department's Patrol Evaluation System and two named officers. You claim that the requested 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 that some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides in part 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:
>
> > (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 submitted information includes a completed evaluation made of, for, or by the department, which must be released pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1), unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 or is expressly confidential under other law.[1] Although the department claims that the completed evaluation is excepted from

[1]We note that the department does not claim that any portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code, we note that this exception is a discretionary exception to disclosure that does not constitute "other law" for the purposes of section 552.022.[2] Accordingly, we conclude that the department may not withhold any portion of the completed evaluation under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Because you do not claim, and our review does not indicate, that this document is confidential under other law, it must be released.

We now turn to your arguments regarding section 552.103 for the remaining submitted information, which is not subject to section 552.022. Section 552.103 provides in pertinent 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 department maintains the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the governmental body receives 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, 481 (Tex. App.— Austin 1997, no pet.); *see also 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 department must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

---

[2]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.

You state that "a claim and lawsuit has been filed against the City of Dallas and the [d]epartment alleging wrongful death and excessive force." You also state that the submitted information "provides extensive details regarding the officers involved in the above-mentioned request." Based on our review of your representations and the submitted information, we conclude that the department has demonstrated that litigation is pending and that the submitted information is related to that litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Accordingly, we conclude that the department may withhold the submitted information from disclosure 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 opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and may not be withheld from disclosure on that basis. 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 completed evaluation we have marked must be released in accordance with section 552.022. The remaining submitted information may be withheld under section 552.103 unless all parties to the anticipated litigation have previously had access to it.

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 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,

Lauren E. Kleine

Lauren E. Kleine
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEK/seg

Ref: ID# 199983

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. James Skinner
Pezzull, Kinser LLP
17304 Preston Road, Suite 700
Dallas, Texas 75252
(w/o enclosures)