



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 12, 2004

Mr. William W. Krueger, III
Fletcher & Springer, L.L.P.
8750 North Central Expressway, 16th Floor
Dallas, Texas 75231

OR2004-5696

Dear Mr. Krueger:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 204926.

The City of Princeton (the "city"), which you represent, received three requests from the same requestor for (1) names and salaries of employees during a certain time period, including pay increases, (2) any impact fees collected and "who paid for it" during a certain time period, and (3) minutes from budget meetings that occurred during a certain time period. You claim that 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 representative samples of information.¹

¹ We assume that the "representative samples" of records submitted to this office are truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

We also note that you have redacted portions of the submitted information prior to submitting such information for our review. We advise that section 552.301 of the Government Code requires a governmental body to submit responsive information in a manner that permits this office to review the information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D). Therefore, the city risks non-compliance with section 552.301 if it fails to submit responsive documents in non-redacted form. Such non-compliance can result in a conclusion from this office that the information at issue must be released. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .301, .302. We accordingly advise that with respect to any future requests for an open records decision from this office, the city should submit any responsive documents in non-redacted form. *See also id.* § 552.3035 (attorney general may not disclose to requestor or public any information submitted to attorney general under section 552.301(e)(1)(D)).

Initially, we note that a portion of the submitted information consists of the minutes of a public meeting of the city council. The minutes, tape recordings, and agendas of a governmental body's public meetings are specifically made public by statute. *See* Gov't Code §§ 551.022 (minutes and tape recordings), 551.043 (notice). Information made public by statute may not be withheld from the public under any of the Public Information Act's (the "Act") exceptions to public disclosure. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 544 (1990), 378 (1983), 161 (1977), 146 (1976). Accordingly, the submitted minutes of a public meeting of the city council must be released in accordance with the Open Meetings Act. *See* Gov't Code § 551.022.

We also note that some of the submitted information is subject to required public disclosure under section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in relevant part:

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:

...

(2) the name, sex, ethnicity, salary, title, and dates of employment of each employee and officer of a governmental body; [and]

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public funds or other funds by a governmental body[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(2), (3). One of the present requests asks for the names and salaries of employees, including pay increases. The submitted information includes this information, as well as information from a voucher that relates to the receipt of funds by the city. Therefore, as prescribed by section 552.022, the city must release this information unless it is confidential under other law. Section 552.103 of the Government Code is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects the governmental body's interests and is therefore not other law that makes information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a). *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Thus, the city may not withhold this information under section 552.103. As the city claims no other exceptions for this information, it must be released to the requestor. We will address your claimed exception for the remaining submitted information.

You assert that the remaining submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code, which provides as follows:

(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 governmental body has 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 was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *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). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 552.103(a).

You have submitted a copy of the Plaintiff's Original Petition in *Mueller and Durant v. City of Princeton, Texas*, No. 04-03-235 (271st Dist. Ct., Wise County, Tex., filed Mar. 31, 2004), which indicates that two named individuals filed a lawsuit against the city on March 31, 2004. Based our review of your arguments and the remaining submitted information, we conclude that the city was involved in pending litigation on the date it received the present request. Further, we conclude that the remaining submitted information is related to the pending litigation. Therefore, the city may withhold the remaining submitted information pursuant to section 552.103.

We note, however, 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. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the pending lawsuit 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).

In summary, the city must release the submitted minutes of a public meeting under section 551.022 of the Government Code. The city must release the information we have marked under section 552.022 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the remaining submitted information pursuant to section 552.103.

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,



Amy D. Peterson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ADP/sdk

Ref: ID# 204926

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Philip Durant
3712 Ballet Court
Plano, Texas 75023
(w/o enclosures)