ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 21, 2013

Ms. Andrea D. Russell
Counsel for the city of Southlake
Taylor, Olson, Adkins, Sralla, Elam, LLP
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2013-02910

Dear Ms. Russell:

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# 479502.

The City of Southlake (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all documents related to water leak testing in a specified area from a specified time period. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.136 of the Government Code.[1] You state you will redact information in accordance with sections 552.130(c)[2] and 552.147(b)[3] of the Government Code and Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).[4] We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the

---

[1]Although you do not specifically raise section 552.136, you have marked information for which you appear to claim this exception. Accordingly, we will address section 552.136, as this section is a mandatory exception to disclosure. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.007, .352; Open Records Decision No. 674 at 3 n.4 (2001) (mandatory exceptions).

[2]Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact, without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office, the motor vehicle record information described in subsections 552.130(a)(1) and (a)(3). *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c); *see also id.* § 552.130(d)-(e) (requestor may appeal governmental body's decision to withhold information under section 552.130(c) to attorney general and governmental body withholding information pursuant to section 552.130(c) must provide certain notice to requestor).

[3]Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

[4]We note Open Records Decision No. 684 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 opinion.

submitted information. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note portions of Exhibit B, which we have indicated, are not responsive to the instant request because they were not created during the specified time period. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the city is not required to release non-responsive information in response to this request.

Next, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(1) provides for the required public disclosure of "a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body," unless it is excepted by section 552.108 of the Government Code or made confidential under the Act or other law. *Id.* § 552.022(a)(1). Exhibit B includes completed reports and evaluations that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the completed reports and evaluations pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless they are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(1). You raise section 552.103 of the Gove nment Code for this information; however, section 552.103 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, none of the information encompassed by section 552.022(a)(1) may be withheld under section 552.103. As you raise no further exceptions to its disclosure, the information encompassed by section 552.022(a)(1), which we have marked, must be released.

Next, we address your arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022. 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 purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information relating to litigation through discovery procedures. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4-5 (1990). 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 that the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *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.); ORD 551 at 4. A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a).

To demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Id.* We 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). In Open Records Decision 638 (1996), this office stated that, when a governmental body receives a notice of claim letter, it can meet its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated by representing that the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act (the "TTCA"), Civil Practice and Remedies Code, chapter 101, or an applicable municipal ordinance. If that representation is not made, the receipt of the claim letter is a factor we will consider in determining, from the totality of the circumstances presented, whether the governmental body has established litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* ORD 638 at 4.

You state, and provide documentation showing, that prior to the city's receipt of the instant request for information, the city anticipated litigation regarding the information at issue. The submitted information reflects that prior to the city's receipt of the instant request for information, the city received a notice of claim letter alleging liability on the part of the city for property damage at the property at issue. You do not affirmatively represent to this office that the claim letter complies with the TTCA or an applicable ordinance; therefore, we will only consider the claim letter as a factor in determining whether the city reasonably anticipated litigation over the incident in question. Nevertheless, based on your representations, our review of the submitted information, and the totality of the circumstances, we determine the city has established it reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the request for information. We also conclude the information in Exhibit C and the responsive information not subject to section 552.022(a)(1) in Exhibit B is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Accordingly, the city may withhold this information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.[5]

---

[5]As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

We note, however, once the information at issue has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to the information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has concluded or is no longer reasonably anticipated. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, the city must release the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code, which we have marked. The remaining responsive information may be withheld 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,

Kathryn R. Mattingly
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KRM/bhf

Ref: ID# 479502

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)