ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 6, 2014

Ms. Jessica D. Richard
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of New Braunfels
424 South Castell Avenue
New Braunfels, Texas 78130

OR2014-02344

Dear Ms. Richard:

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# 513315.

The City of New Braunfels (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident.[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.[2]

---

[1]We note the city sought and received clarification regarding the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information); *see City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed). You also inform us the requestor was required to make a deposit for payment of anticipated costs for the request under section 552.263 of the Government Code, which the city received on November 7, 2013. *See* Gov't Code § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date that governmental body receives deposit or bond).

[2]We 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

Section 552.103 provides, in 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). 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 of its receipt of 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 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *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).

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

---

to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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, the instant request for information is part of a notice of claim letter sent to the city. You do not affirmatively represent to this office that the notice of claim complies with the TTCA or an applicable ordinance; therefore, we will only consider the claim 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 find the city has established it reasonably anticipated litigation at the time it received the instant request. Furthermore, we find the submitted information is related to the anticipated litigation. Therefore, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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).

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,

Thana Hussaini
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TH/som

Ref: ID# 513315

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)