



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 9, 2008

Ms. Lillian Guillen Graham
Assistant City Attorney
City of Mesquite
P.O. Box 850137
Mesquite, Texas 75185-0137

OR2008-00417

Dear Ms. Graham:

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# 299211.

The Mesquite Police Department (the "department") received two requests for in-car video recordings and audio recordings pertaining to a specified vehicle pursuit. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code 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.

...

¹ Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code, you have submitted no arguments in support of the applicability of this exception. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A). Therefore, you have provided this office with no basis for finding information confidential under this exception.

(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: (1) that litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information and (2) that the information at issue is related to that 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.); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103.

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. *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. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* 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. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

Upon review, we conclude that you have failed to demonstrate that any party has taken any concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation involving the department. *See* ORD 331. Thus, you have not established that the department reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the requests for information. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Next, the department argues the submitted information may be excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.108 of the Government Code. Section 552.108(a) excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime.” Gov't Code § 552.108(a). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108 must

reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state that the information you seek to withhold under section 552.108 relates to an internal affairs investigation being conducted by the department. Section 552.108 is generally not applicable to information relating to an administrative investigation that did not result in a criminal investigation or prosecution. *See Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525-26 (Tex. Civ. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 at 3-4 (1982). You do not indicate that the administrative investigation has resulted in a criminal investigation or prosecution. Accordingly, you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108 to the submitted information and none of it may be withheld on this basis.

Finally, the department asserts a portion of the submitted information is subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 excepts from disclosure “information [that] relates to . . . a motor vehicle operator’s or driver’s license or permit issued by an agency of this state [or] a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state.” Gov’t Code § 552.130. The submitted recordings include a Texas license plate number. However, the vehicle in question appears to have been owned by an individual who is now deceased. Section 552.130 protects the privacy interest of an individual, and because that right of privacy is purely personal, it lapses upon death. *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref’d n.r.e.); *see also* Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) ; H-917 (1976); Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981). Accordingly, the Texas license plate number must be withheld under section 552.130 only if a living person owns an interest in the vehicle. If the department lacks the technical capability to redact this information from the recordings, it must withhold the recordings in their entirety. *See* Open Records Decision No. 364 (1983). If no living person owns an interest in the vehicle, then the information in question is not excepted from disclosure and must be released.

In summary, the department must withhold the Texas license plate number in the submitted recordings under section 552.130 if a living person owns an interest in the vehicle. If the department lacks the technical capability to redact this information from the records, it must withhold the recordings in their entirety. If no living person owns an interest in the vehicle, then the information in question is not excepted from disclosure and must be released along with the remaining submitted information.

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,



Chanita Chantaplin-McLelland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CC/mcf

Ref: ID# 299211

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Mr. Scott LeWinter
FOX 4 Assignments Desk
400 North Griffin Street
Dallas, Texas 75202
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gerardo Lopez
Assignment Editor
KTVT-TV CBS 11 News
10111 North Central Expressway
Dallas, Texas 75231
(w/o enclosures)