



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 22, 2004

Ms. Carol Longoria
Public Information Coordinator
The University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2004-6129

Dear Ms. Longoria:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 205648.

The University of Texas at Arlington (the "university") received two requests for information relating to a fire. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.108, 552.1175, and 552.136 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and have reviewed the information you submitted.

We first note that some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides in part that

[w]ithout limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, 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). In this instance, the submitted information includes a completed report made of, or, or by a governmental body. The completed report must be released under section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section

552.108 of the Government Code or expressly confidential under other law. Although you also seek to withhold the report under section 552.103, we note that this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; *Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (Gov't Code § 552.103 may be waived); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.103 subject to waiver). As such, section 552.103 is not other law that makes information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, the university may not withhold the completed report under section 552.103.

Section 552.108 excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication.[.]” Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information that the governmental body seeks to withhold. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977); Open Records Decision No. 434 at 2-3 (1986).

Section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable only if the information in question relates to a concluded case that did not result in a conviction or a deferred adjudication. You state that the submitted report relates to a closed police investigation that did not result in a conviction or a deferred adjudication. Based on your representation, we find that section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable in this instance.

Section 552.108 does not except from disclosure “basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.” Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic front-page information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177, 186-87 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). *See* Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). The university must release basic information under section 552.108(c), even if the information does not literally appear on the front page of an offense or arrest report. The university may withhold the rest of the information in the report under section 552.108(a)(2).

Next, we address your claim under section 552.103. This exception 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 governmental body has 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. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate that: (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information *and* (2) the information at issue is related to the pending or anticipated 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.). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990)

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” *Id.* Among other examples, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated where the opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: (1) filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (“EEOC”), *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); (2) 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 (3) threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

You inform us that the university has received two notices of potential litigation with regard to the incident to which the submitted information pertains. You also inform us, and have provided documentation reflecting, that the university received these notices prior to its receipt of these requests for information. Based on your representations and the submitted documentation, we find that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the university received these requests for information. We also find that the submitted information relates to the anticipated litigation. We therefore conclude that the information that is not subject to section 552.022 is excepted from disclosure at this time under section 552.103.

In reaching this conclusion, we assume that the opposing parties in the anticipated litigation have not seen or had access to any of the information at issue. The purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing

parties to obtain information that relates to litigation through discovery procedures. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4-5 (1990). If the opposing parties have already seen or had access to information that relates to anticipated or pending litigation, through discovery or otherwise, then there is no interest in withholding such information from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). We also note that the applicability of section 552.103 ends when the related litigation concludes or is no longer reasonably anticipated. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary: (1) with the exception of the basic information that must be released under section 552.108(c), the university may withhold the police report under section 552.108(a)(2); and (2) the university may withhold the rest of the submitted information under section 552.103. As we are able to make these determinations, we need not address your other arguments against disclosure.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J.W. Morris, III", is written over a horizontal line. The signature is stylized and includes a large circular flourish on the left side.

James W. Morris, III
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JWM/sdk

Ref: ID# 205648

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Wilmer Avilez
Adrian Crane and Associates, P.C.
8111 LBJ Freeway, Suite 1065
Dallas, Texas 75251-1313
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark H. Whatley
Unified Investigations & Sciences, Inc.
1555 Oakbrook Drive, Suite 135
Norcross, Georgia 30093
(w/o enclosures)