



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 15, 2005

Mr. Carey E. Smith
General Counsel
Texas Health and Human Services Commission
P. O. Box 13247
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2005-10283

Dear Mr. Smith:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 236139.

The Texas Health and Human Services Commission (the "commission") received a request for three categories of information related to Medicaid managed care. You state that you are releasing portions of the requested information. You claim that the remaining 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 representative sample of information.¹

As a preliminary matter, you inform us that a portion of the information at issue in the present request was the subject of prior rulings of this office, issued as Open Records Letter Nos. 2004-10816 (2004), 2004-3557 (2004), and 2004-0543 (2004). See Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (governmental body may rely on prior ruling as previous determination when 1) the records or information at issue are precisely the same records or information that were previously submitted to this office pursuant to

¹We 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.

section 552.301(e)(1)(D); 2) the governmental body which received the request for the records or information is the same governmental body that previously requested and received a ruling from the attorney general; 3) the prior ruling concluded that the precise records or information are or are not excepted from disclosure under the Act; and 4) the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have not changed since the issuance of the ruling). We understand you to represent that the pertinent facts and circumstances have not changed since the issuance of Open Records Letter Nos. 2004-10816 (2004), 2004-3557 (2004), and 2004-0543 (2004). Thus, to the extent the records at issue in the present request are identical to the records that were the subject of these prior rulings, we determine the commission may rely on those rulings as previous determinations for such records. To the extent the submitted records are not identical to the records at issue in Open Records Letter Nos. 2004-10816 (2004), 2004-3557 (2004), and 2004-0543 (2004), we address your claimed exceptions to disclosure.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides:

(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. The commission 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, 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 commission must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See id.* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). On the other hand, 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).

You state that the commission is "currently defending challenges by two health plans participating in the Medicaid managed care program." You state, and provide documentation showing, that the submitted information relates to litigation involving the commission as a party which is styled *Equal Access for El Paso, Inc., et al. v. Albert Hawkins, Commissioner of the Texas Health and Human Services Commission*, and which was pending in the El Paso division of the Western District of Texas at the time that the commission received this request for information. You also inform us that one of the health plans filed a notice of claim for breach of contract against the commission on February 26, 2004. After reviewing your arguments and the submitted document, we agree that the records at issue relate to both pending and anticipated litigation and may, therefore, be withheld from disclosure under section 552.103(a).

In reaching this conclusion, we assume that the opposing parties in the pending and anticipated litigation have not seen or had access to any of the information that the commission seeks to withhold under section 552.103. The purpose of this exception is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information that relates to the litigation through discovery procedures. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4-5 (1990). If the opposing parties have seen or had access to information that relates to 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 further note that the applicability of section 552.103 ends once the related litigation concludes. *See* 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).

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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Candice M. De La Garza
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CMD/krl

Ref: ID# 236139

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. John A. Hesse
Director, Finance-Contract Administration
The University of Texas
Medical Branch at Galveston
Lipton Tea Building, Room 1.430
301 University Blvd.
Galveston, Texas 77555-0914
(w/o enclosures)