



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 22, 2013

Mr. Gary B. Lawson
Counsel for the Dallas Police and Fire Pension System
Strasburger & Price, L.L.P.
901 Main Street, Suite 4400
Dallas, Texas 75202

OR2013-20401

Dear Mr. Lawson:

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# 506592.

The Dallas Police and Fire Pension System (the "system"), which you represent, received a request for e-mails exchanged between two named individuals during a specified period of time. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.143 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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

¹Although you have also marked portions of the submitted information under rules 192.3 and 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence, we note sections 552.111 and 552.107 of the Government Code are the appropriate exceptions to raise for the attorney work product privilege and for the attorney-client privilege, respectively, for information not subject to section 552.022. We also note section 552.101 does not encompass civil discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision No.647 at 2 (1996). Further, although you also appear to raise section 552.022 of the Government Code, we note section 552.022 is not an exception to disclosure. Rather, section 552.022 enumerates categories of information that are not excepted from disclosure unless they are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022.

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 section 552.103(a) 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 the governmental body received 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, 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). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551.

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See 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.² Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* 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. *See* 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).

You contend the system reasonably anticipates litigation because it is currently in a dispute with the Nasher Sculpture Center (the "Nasher"). You explain representatives of the Nasher

²In 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).

have made allegations that glare emanating from the glass walls of the Museum Tower, a high-rise residential condominium owned by the system, is damaging the Nasher's art and vegetation and creating an unpleasant experience for visitors. You state representatives of the Museum Tower and the Nasher recently participated in mediation efforts, which were unsuccessful. You indicate all efforts short of litigation to resolve the dispute have failed and state the system anticipates being a party to a suit regarding the Museum Tower. You also argue there would be legal and financial recourse against the system as a result of any lawsuit. Based on your representations and our review, we determine the system has established it reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the request for information. We also find the information at issue is related to this anticipated litigation. Accordingly, the system may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.³

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).

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, 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,



Paige Lay
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PL/eb

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

Mr. Gary B. Lawson - Page 4

Ref: ID# 506592

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)