



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

September 17, 2004

Mr. James G. Nolan  
Attorney IV  
Texas Department of Family and Protective Services  
P.O. Box 149030  
Austin, Texas 78714

OR2004-7970

Dear Mr. Nolan:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 209265.

The Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (the "department") received a request for certain communications in which the requestor is mentioned. The requestor specifically states that he is seeking this information "as it becomes available." You claim that the requested information, or portions thereof, is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.137 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Although you initially raised section 552.108, you have not submitted arguments explaining how this exception applies to the submitted information. Therefore, we presume that you have withdrawn this exception. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301,.302.

<sup>2</sup> We assume that the representative sample of records submitted to this office is 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.

Initially, we note that the request for information appears to be a standing request for information "as it becomes available." It is implicit in several provisions of the Public Information Act (the "Act") that the Act only applies to information that is already in existence. See Gov't Code §§ 552.002, 552.021, 552.227, 552.351. The Act does not require a governmental body to prepare new information in response to a request. See Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 87 (1975), 342 at 3 (1982), 416 at 5 (1984), 452 at 2-3 (1986), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 572 at 1 (1990). Consequently, a governmental body is not required to comply with a standing request to supply information on a periodic basis as such information is prepared in the future. See Attorney General Opinion JM-48 at 2 (1983); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 465 at 1 (1987), 476 at 1 (1987).

Next, we note that a portion of the submitted information, that we have marked, is not responsive to the request for information. Accordingly, we conclude that the department need not provide the requestor with this particular marked information in response to this ruling.

We now address your claims under section 552.103 for the remaining submitted information. Section 552.103 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). 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 is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body receives the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Thomas v. Cornyn*, 71 S.W.3d 473, 487 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *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). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

In demonstrating that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the department 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.<sup>3</sup> *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 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 department is realistically contemplated regarding the subject matter of this request. Based on your arguments, the totality of the circumstances surrounding this request, and our review of the remaining submitted information, we find that the department has adequately demonstrated that it reasonably anticipated litigation with regard to the subject matter of this request on the date that it received the request. Furthermore, we find that the remaining submitted information relates to the anticipated litigation. Accordingly, we conclude that the department may withhold the remaining submitted information pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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. *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.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> 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).

<sup>4</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your other claimed exceptions.

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 "Debbie K. Lee". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Debbie K. Lee  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DKL/seg

Ref: ID# 209265

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Max Higgs  
500 East San Antonio Street  
El Paso, Texas 79912  
(w/o enclosures)