



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 18, 2008

Mr. Brett Norbraten
Open Records Attorney
Texas Department of Aging and Disability Services
P.O. Box 149030
Austin, Texas 78714-9030

OR2008-15793

Dear Mr. Norbraten:

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# 328202.

The Texas Department of Aging and Disability Services (the "department") received a request for disciplinary action taken against Austin State School staff in regards to thirteen specified cases, as well as the job title of the staff members who were disciplined. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments submitted by a representative of the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit written comments regarding availability of requested information).

Initially, we must address the requestor's contention that the submitted information consists of completed investigations subject to required public disclosure under section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(1). The department states that submitted information does not consist of completed investigations, but instead is "directly germane to the issue of employee discipline after the completion of abuse and neglect investigations[.]" Accordingly, based on the representations of the department, we conclude that the submitted information is not subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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(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, 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). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 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). To demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *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.¹ 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).

The department states that prior to the instant request, it was subject to action by the United States Department of Justice ("DOJ") "under the Civil Rights of Institutionalized Persons

¹In 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).

Act ("CRIPA") . . . by virtue of the DOJ's investigation into and report on conditions at the Lubbock State School." The department states that under CRIPA, the DOJ's time frame for filing a lawsuit has not elapsed, and "it is likely that the DOJ will file a lawsuit in federal court to incorporate the settlement agreement into a judgment enforceable by the court, as that is the DOJ's usual practice in CRIPA investigations." The department further explains that it is currently "anticipating federal CRIPA litigation and/or settlement negotiations with respect to the [Austin State School]" as well. The department states that this litigation is anticipated because on March 11, 2008, the DOJ informed Governor Rick Perry that it is commencing an investigation into the "conditions of care and treatment of residents at the Denton State School, pursuant to [its] authority under [CRIPA]." The department argues that this letter to the Governor is analogous to a notice letter under the Texas Tort Claims Act. In addition, the department has provided this office with a copy of a similar letter from the DOJ dated August 20, 2008, indicating that CRIPA investigations would be taken on the remaining facilities in the state, including Austin State School. The department asserts that "based on the procedures employed by the DOJ in its investigation of Lubbock, litigation relating to Austin State School is reasonably anticipated." Based on your representations and our review, we determine that the department reasonably anticipated litigation on the date that it received this request for information. You state the information at issue relates to the anticipated litigation because it is the type of information the DOJ will be investigating for possible litigation. Thus, we find the submitted information is related to the anticipated litigation. Therefore, the department may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.²

We note, however, that once 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 that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party 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 when the litigation has concluded or is no longer reasonably anticipated. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 at 2 (1982); Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2 (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

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.

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). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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,



Paige Savoie
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PS/ma

Ref: ID# 328202

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)