



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 20, 2010

Ms. Anna Maria Jimenez  
Nueces County District Attorney  
105th Judicial District  
901 Leopard Street, Room 206  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78401-3681

OR2010-10765

Dear Ms. Jimenez:

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# 387401.

The Nueces County District Attorney (the "district attorney") received a request for a specified grievance. You claim that 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:

(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 the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body receives the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See Thomas v. Cornyn*, 71 S.W.3d 473, 487 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *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 governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

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. *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). We also note that 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 contend the submitted information relates to reasonably anticipated litigation from the individual who filed the grievance at issue. You state "the allegations used in the grievance form are terms used to describe alleged employment discrimination from Title VII of the Civil Rights Act [and] the Age Discrimination in Employment Act[.]" Additionally, you inform us the individual who filed the grievance has hired attorneys who repeatedly sue Nueces County. You state that one of these attorneys publically stated that he "plans to seek all damages and benefits [for his client] under employment law." We note, however, that the news story in which this statement appeared is dated May 7, 2010, which is after the May 6, 2010 date on which the district attorney received the request for information. You do not provide, and the submitted information does not reveal, any concrete evidence showing that the individual who filed the grievance or her attorneys actually threatened to file suit against the district attorney or otherwise took objective steps toward filing suit prior to the district attorney's receipt of the request. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982)

(construing statutory predecessor). Moreover, you have not explained how the grievance process at issue is considered to be litigation for purposes of section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991) (discussing factors used by attorney general in determining whether administrative proceeding not subject to Administrative Procedure Act may be considered litigation); *see also* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1) (requiring governmental body to explain applicability of raised exception). Thus, we find you have failed to establish the district attorney reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the instant request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.103(c). Therefore, the district attorney may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note portions of the submitted information may be subject to sections 552.117 and 552.137 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.117(a)(1), .024. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it was made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Accordingly, if the former employee at issue timely elected to keep her personal information confidential, the district attorney must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117. However, the district attorney may not withhold this information under section 552.117 if the former employee did not make a timely election to keep her information confidential.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body," unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The personal e-mail addresses in the remaining information are not specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). As such, these e-mail addresses, which we have marked, must be withheld under section 552.137 unless the owners of the addresses have affirmatively consented to their release.<sup>2</sup> *See id.* § 552.137(b).

In summary, the district attorney must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code if the former district attorney employee to whom it pertains made a timely election for confidentiality under section 552.024 of the

---

<sup>1</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).


<sup>2</sup>We note this office recently issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

Government Code. The district attorney must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code unless their owners have affirmatively consented to their release. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



James McGuire  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JM/dls

Ref: ID# 387401

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)