



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 3, 2005

Ms. Karen Rabon
Assistant Attorney General
Public Information Coordinator
Office of the Attorney General
P.O. Box 12548
Austin, Texas 78711-2548

OR2005-07013

Dear Ms. Rabon:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 228433.

The Office of the Attorney General (the "OAG") received a request for information since January 1, 2003 that reflects the OAG's actions or communications regarding specified subprime lenders, consumer complaints against Hibernia and Ameriquest Mortgage Company ("Ameriquest") since January 1, 2003, a list with information regarding the consumer complaints filed against the other subprime lenders, and intra-agency or multi-state communications concerning the named subprime lenders. The requestor clarified that he does not seek any internal OAG communications and work product. The OAG has released some of the information and claims the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. In addition, the OAG asserts that release of some of the information may implicate the proprietary interest of Ameriquest. Accordingly, the OAG notified Ameriquest of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (permitting third party with proprietary interest to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under Public Information Act in certain circumstances). In response to the OAG's notification, this office received comments from

Ameriquet. We have considered all of the submitted comments and have reviewed the submitted sample documents.¹

Section 552.103, the litigation exception, provides in relevant part 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), (c). The OAG has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in this particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the request for information is received, 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). The OAG must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

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). When the governmental body is the prospective plaintiff in litigation, the evidence of anticipated litigation must at least reflect that litigation involving a specific matter is "realistically contemplated." See Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989); see also Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982) (investigatory file may be withheld if governmental body's attorney determines that it should be withheld pursuant to Gov't Code § 552.103 and that litigation is "reasonably likely to result").

¹We assume that the "sample" 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.

In this instance, the OAG states the Consumer Protection and Public Health Division is currently investigating Ameriquest and other lenders for potential violations of the Texas Deceptive Trade Practices-Consumer Protection Act. The OAG further explains these investigations antedated the request for information, may result in litigation, and were undertaken for that purpose. The OAG also states the information relates to these anticipated lawsuits. After reviewing the OAG's arguments and the submitted records, we conclude the OAG may withhold the information under section 552.103 because it relates to the OAG's anticipated litigation.²

Generally, however, 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 parties in the anticipated litigation 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).

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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).

²Because section 552.103 is dispositive, we do not address the other arguments asserted.

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); *Tex. 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,



Yen-Ha Le
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

YHL/sdk

Ref: ID# 228433

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Matthew Lee
Executive Director
Inner City Press/Fair Finance Watch
P.O. Box 580188
Bronx, New York 10458
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Thomas J. Noto
General Counsel
Ameriquest Capital Corporation
1100 Town & Country Road, Suite 1100
Orange, California 92868
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Ketih Paul Bishop
Buchalter, Nemer, Fields & Younger
18400 Von Karman Avenue, Suite 800
Irvine, California 92612
(w/o enclosures)