



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 20, 2012

Mr. Randy Holland
Chief of Police
Johnson City Police Department
P.O. Box 159
Johnson City, Texas 78636

OR2012-11306

Dear Mr. Hollan:

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# 459687.

The Johnson City Police Department (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]" Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body must reasonably explain how release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state the submitted information pertains to a pending criminal investigation. Based on your representation and our review of the information, we conclude release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of a crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court describes law enforcement interests that are present

in active cases), *writ ref'd per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Therefore, section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code generally applies to the submitted information.

We note, however, the submitted information includes a criminal trespass warning notice. The department provided a copy of this notice to the individual being warned. You have not explained how releasing this information, which has already been seen by the individual being warned, would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). Accordingly, the criminal trespass warning notice may not be withheld under section 552.108. In addition, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure "basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime." *Id.* § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic "front-page" information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88. Basic information must be released, even if it does not literally appear on the front page of the report. *See* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). Therefore, with the exception of the criminal trespass warning form and basic information, the department may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1).

You also raise section 552.103 of the Government Code. We note section 552.103 generally does not except from disclosure the basic information described in *Houston Chronicle* that must be released pursuant to section 552.108(c). However, we will address your argument under section 552.103 for the criminal trespass warning notice. Section 552.103 provides, in relevant 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 that the section 552.103(a) exception applies 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 requested information is related to that litigation. *See 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 parts of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

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 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. 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). In the context of anticipated litigation in which the governmental body is the prospective plaintiff, the concrete evidence must at least reflect that litigation is "realistically contemplated." *See* ORD 518 at 5; *see also* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982) (finding that investigatory file may be withheld from disclosure if governmental body attorney determines that it should be withheld pursuant to section 552.103 and that litigation is "reasonably likely to result").

You state Johnson City (the "city") or the requestor may bring litigation against the other. However, as noted above, the fact that an individual threatened to file suit is not sufficient to show that a governmental body reasonably anticipated litigation. You have not otherwise demonstrated that the individual at issue had taken any concrete steps towards litigation on the date the request was received. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). In addition, you have not demonstrated that it is "reasonably likely" the city will bring litigation against the requestor. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the department reasonably anticipated litigation when the request for information was received. *See* Gov't Code

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).

§§ 552.103(c) (governmental body must demonstrate that litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on or before the date it received request for information); .301(e)(1) (requiring governmental body to explain applicability of raised exception). Accordingly, the department may not withhold the criminal trespass warning notice under section 552.103. As you raise no further exceptions for this information, it must be released to the requestor.

In summary, with the exception of the criminal trespass warning notice and basic information, which must be released, the department may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) 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,



Misty Haberer Barham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MHB/som

Ref: ID# 459687

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)