



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

November 7, 2013

Mr. Michael Bostic  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Dallas  
1500 Marilla Street, Room 7DN  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2013-19474

Dear Mr. Bostic:

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# 505022.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for the requestor's client's personnel file, documents pertaining to the requestor's client's discrimination complaints, and documents pertaining to specified promotions. You state you are releasing some of the requested information to the requestor. You further state you are redacting information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).<sup>1</sup> You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.114, and 552.117

---

<sup>1</sup>Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information, including Texas driver's license and license plate numbers under section 552.130 of the Government Code and e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. However, the Texas legislature recently amended section 552.130 to allow a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) of the Government Code without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Thus, the statutory amendment to section 552.130 of the Government Code supercedes Open Records Decision No. 684. Therefore, a governmental body may redact information subject to subsection 552.130(a) only in accordance with section 552.130, not Open Records Decision No. 684.

of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>3</sup>

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in 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 that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documentation sufficient to establish the applicability of this exception to the information that it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate 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 the pending or anticipated litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *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 from disclosure under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

In order to demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation might ensue is

---

<sup>2</sup>Although you also claim section 552.026 of the Government Code, we note section 552.026 is not an exception to disclosure. Rather, section 552.026 provides the Act does not require the release of information contained in education records except in conformity with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA") of 1974. Gov't Code § 552.026.

<sup>3</sup>We assume the "representative sample" of information 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than those submitted to this office.

more than mere conjecture.” Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). This office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (the “EEOC”). *See* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982).

You state, and submit documentation showing, prior to the city’s receipt of the instant request, the requestor’s client filed a complaint with the EEOC alleging discrimination and retaliation. You state the submitted information is directly related to the anticipated litigation. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the submitted information is related to litigation reasonably anticipated at the time the city received the request for information. Therefore, we find the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103.<sup>4</sup>

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 anticipated. *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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Sarah Casterline  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

SEC/tch

---

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

Ref: ID# 505022

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)