



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 28, 2013

Ms. Paige H. Saenz
For City of Jonestown
McKamie Krueger & Knight, L.L.P.
223 West Anderson Lane, Suite A105
Austin, Texas 78752

OR2013-08775

Dear Ms. Saenz:

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# 490399.

The City of Jonestown (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for maps, estimates, cost projections, plans, inter-local agreements, and correspondence related to the Jonestown Water Supply Corporation and any agreements or proposed agreements related to a specified entity or "developer" that was used in a specified service plan and information pertaining to a proposed amendment to the service plan. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

¹Although you raised section 552.101 of the Government Code, you did not provide any arguments regarding the applicability of this section. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn this exception. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

²We assume that 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.

(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 section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of section 552.103 to the information it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate: (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *See Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).*

You state, and provide documentation showing, prior to the city's receipt of the instant request, a lawsuit styled *Centex Homes v. City of Jonestown*, Cause No. D-1-GN-11-003152, was filed and is currently pending against the city in the 250th District Court of Travis County, Texas. Therefore, we agree litigation to which the city was a party was pending on the date the city received the present request for information. You also state the information at issue pertains to the substance of the lawsuit claims. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information at issue is related to the pending litigation. Therefore, we conclude the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.³

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the 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 all parties to the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of

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

section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

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,



Vanessa Burgess
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

VB/dls

Ref: ID# 490399

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)