



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 17, 2008

Ms. Leslie Spear Pearce  
Plainview City Attorney  
City of Plainview  
901 Broadway  
Plainview, Texas 79072

OR2008-05166

Dear Ms. Pearce:

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# 307894.

The Plainview Police Department (the "department") received a request for copies of four specified incident reports and any additional incident reports pertaining to a named individual. You state that you have released some of the responsive information. You claim that a portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in 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 department 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 showing that (1) the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the department received the request for information, 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 [1<sup>st</sup> Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The department 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. *Id.* In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated that a governmental body has met its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter and the governmental body represents that the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act ("TTCA"), chapter 101 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code, or an applicable municipal ordinance. If a governmental body does not make this representation, the claim letter is a factor that this office will consider in determining whether a governmental body has established that litigation is reasonably anticipated based on the totality of the circumstances.

You state that the City of Plainview (the "city") reasonably anticipates litigation concerning the incident specified in the request. You also provide documentation showing that, prior to the department's receipt of the present request, an attorney for the estate of an individual involved in the specified incident filed a notice of claim against the city concerning allegations of violations of the individual's constitutional rights by the department's officers. We note, however, that you have not represented that this notice of claim meets the requirements of the TTCA. Therefore, we will only consider the claim as a factor in determining whether the department reasonably anticipated litigation over the incident in question. Based on your representations, our review of the submitted information, and the totality of the circumstances, we agree that litigation was reasonably anticipated on the date the request was received. Furthermore, we find that the submitted information relates to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a).

We note, however, that basic factual information about a crime must be released. Open Records Decision No. 362 (1983). You indicate that you have released basic information to the requestor in conjunction with *Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App. — Houston [14<sup>th</sup> Dist.] 1975, writ ref'd n.r.e.). See Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976). Basic information includes the identification and description of the complaint. See ORD 127. With the exception of this basic information, which you state has been released, the department may withhold the submitted information pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code.

However, once the information has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to the information. See Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, any submitted information that has either been obtained from or provided to all other parties in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has concluded or is no longer anticipated. See Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); see also 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 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,



Jessica J. Maloney  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JJM/jh

Ref: ID# 307894

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Gregory W. Smith  
Roberts Markel, P.C.  
2800 Post Oak Boulevard, 57<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Houston, Texas 77056  
(w/o enclosures)