



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 5, 2012

Ms. Meredith Ladd
Counsel for the Town of Flower Mound
Brown & Hofmeister, LLP
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2012-19610

Dear Ms. Ladd:

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# 472886.

The Town of Flower Mound (the "town"), which you represent, received four requests for all e-mails between the town mayor and the town manager for specified time periods and certain documentation, including evaluations, salary history, and a contract, pertaining to a named individual's employment.¹ You claim 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 representative sample of information.

Initially, we note you have not submitted information pertaining to evaluations, salary history, and the named individual's contract. Although you state the town submitted a representative sample of information, no portion of the submitted representative sample pertains to this information. Thus, we find the submitted information is not representative of the information sought in that portion of the request. Please be advised this open records letter applies only to the type of information you have submitted for our review. Therefore, this letter ruling does not authorize the withholding of any other requested records to the

¹The town sought and received clarification of some of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (if governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or over-broad request, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified).

extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302 (where request for attorney general decision does not comply with requirements of section 552.301, information is presumed to be public). Thus, to the extent any information responsive to this portion of the request existed when the present request was received, we assume it has been released.² If such information has not been released, then it must be released at this time. *See id.* §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in relevant 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 governmental body claiming this exception bears the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to demonstrate the applicability of the exception. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is 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). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 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

²We note the Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request or create responsive information. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 555 at 1 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986).

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. 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 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).

We understand you to assert the town reasonably anticipates litigation involving the town manager. You state the town council has placed the town manager on administrative leave, and the town manager has been represented by an attorney during his discussion with the town regarding his employment. You have not, however, informed us the town manager or his legal counsel has taken any concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation. *See* ORDs 452, 555. Therefore, after reviewing your arguments, we find you have not established the town reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Further, we find you have failed to demonstrate litigation was pending on the date the town received the request for information. Consequently, the town may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note the submitted information contains information subject to sections 552.117 and 552.137 of the Government Code.³ Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may only be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. To the extent the employee at issue made a timely election under section 552.024, the town must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1).

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

³The 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).

§ 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses we have marked are not of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Accordingly, the town must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137, unless their owners affirmatively consent to disclosure.⁴

In summary, to the extent the employee at issue made a timely election under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the town must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The town must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137, unless their owners affirmatively consent to disclosure. The remaining information must be released.

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,



Nheka Kanu
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NK/bhf

Ref: ID# 472886

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 4 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

⁴Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.