



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 11, 2012

Ms. Dorothy Palumbo
City Attorney
City of Galveston
P.O. Box 779
Galveston, Texas 77553-0779

OR2012-10739

Dear Ms. Palumbo:

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# 458471 (Galveston ORR # 12-190).

The City of Galveston (the "city") received a request for twelve categories of information pertaining to the construction of the city's Main Wastewater Treatment Plant and Bid #11-12006 over a specified time period.¹ You claim the request is not a request for information under the Act, and, alternatively, you claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.110 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹We note the city asked for and received clarification regarding this request. See Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information); see *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

²We assume 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.

We begin by addressing your claim the present request is not a request for information under the Act, but rather a request for discovery to prepare for litigation. Section 552.0055 of the Government Code provides that “[a] subpoena duces tecum or a request for discovery that is issued in compliance with a statute or a rule of civil or criminal procedure is not considered to be a request for information under this chapter.” Gov’t Code § 552.0055. This section does not apply in all instances in which a governmental body could have received such a subpoena or discovery request. *See Fitzgerald v. Advanced Spine Fixation Sys., Inc.*, 996 S.W.2d 864, 865-66 (Tex. 1999) (in interpreting statutes, goal of discerning legislature’s intent is served by beginning with the statute’s plain language because it is assumed that legislature tried to say what it meant and its words are therefore surest guide to its intent); *see also City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 324 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.) (citing *Sorokolit v. Rhodes*, 889 S.W.2d 239, 241 (Tex. 1994)) (“In applying the plain and common meaning of a statute, [one] may not by implication enlarge the meaning of any word in the statute beyond its ordinary meaning, especially when [one] can discern the legislative intent from a reasonable interpretation of the statute as it is written.”):

You do not assert the request the city received is in fact a “subpoena duces tecum or a request for discovery that is issued in compliance with a statute or a rule of civil or criminal procedure.” Nothing in the request reflects that it meets the elements of a subpoena duces tecum. *See* Code Crim. Proc. arts. 24.02 (defining subpoena duces tecum), .03 (describing procedures for obtaining subpoenas, including subpoena duces tecum). Furthermore, you have not demonstrated, and the request does not indicate, the information was otherwise requested pursuant to the authority of a statute or a rule of civil or criminal procedure. Therefore, we find the city received the request for information under the Act, and we will address whether the city is required to release the submitted information pursuant to the Act.

We note the submitted information includes a notice of a public meeting of the city’s governing body. Notices of a governmental body’s public meetings are specifically made public under provisions of the Open Meetings Act, chapter 551 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 551.041 (governmental body shall give written notice of date, hour, place, and subject of each meeting), .043 (notice of meeting of governmental body must be posted in place readily accessible to general public for at least 72 hours before scheduled time of meeting). As a general rule, the exceptions to disclosure found in the Act do not apply to information that other statutes make public. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 623 at 3 (1994), 525 at 3 (1989). Therefore, the meeting notice we have marked must be released.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides 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). 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 was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body 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 [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 section 552.103(a).

You state, and provide documentation showing, that prior to the city's receipt of the clarification of the request, a lawsuit styled *KST Electric, LTD v. The City of Galveston*, Case No. 12CV1010, was filed and is currently pending in the 10th District Court of Galveston County. You further state the remaining information is related to the pending litigation because it pertains to the claims in the lawsuit. Upon review of your arguments and the information at issue, we find litigation was pending when the city received the clarification of this request for information and the remaining information relates to the pending litigation. Therefore, we conclude the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.³

We note once information has been obtained by all parties to the pending litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. See Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the pending 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 once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).


³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.

In summary, the city must release the meeting notice we have marked in accordance with the Open Meetings Act. The city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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, 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,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/som

Ref: ID# 458471

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)