



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 22, 2016

Ms. Jordan M. Powell  
Assistant District Attorney  
Caldwell County Criminal District Attorney's Office  
1703 South Colorado Street, Box 5  
Lockhart, Texas 78644

OR2016-01618

Dear Ms. Powell:

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# 595280 (Reference #2015-071).

The Caldwell County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office") received a request for information pertaining to the incarceration of the requestor's client. You claim the submitted information is exempted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, we note the submitted information contains fingerprints, the public availability of which is governed by sections 560.001, 560.002, and 560.003 of the Government Code. Section 560.003 of the Government Code provides, "[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under [the Act]." Gov't Code § 560.003; *see id.* § 560.001(1) ("biometric identifier" means retina or iris scan, fingerprint, voiceprint, or record of hand or face geometry). Section 560.002 of the Government Code provides, however, "[a] governmental body that possesses a biometric identifier of an individual . . . may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose the biometric identifier to another person unless . . . the individual consents to the disclosure[.]" *Id.* § 560.002(1)(A). In this instance, the requestor's client is the individual whose fingerprints are at issue. Thus, the requestor has a right of access to his client's fingerprints under section 560.002(1)(A). The general exceptions found in the Act, such as section 552.103 of the Government Code,

---

<sup>1</sup>We assume 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.

cannot impinge on a statutory right of access to information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 613 at 4 (1993), 451 at 4 (1986). Therefore, the sheriff's office must release the requestor's client's fingerprints pursuant to section 560.002 of the Government Code.

Next, we note the submitted information contains court-filed documents. Section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code provides for required public disclosure of "information that is also contained in a public court record[.]" unless the information is expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). Although you seek to withhold this information under section 552.103 of the Government Code, this section 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 No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the sheriff's office may not withhold the court-filed documents, which we have marked, under section 552.103 of the Government Code. As you have not claimed any other exceptions to disclosure for the court-filed documents, the sheriff's office must release these documents. However, we will consider your argument against disclosure of the remaining information.

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 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (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. *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).

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. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* 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 state, and provide supporting documentation showing, simultaneously with the sheriff’s office’s receipt of the instant request, the sheriff’s office received a letter from the requestor stating he represents his client in connection with an injury claim against the sheriff’s office. The requestor requests that the sheriff’s office place a litigation hold on information relating to his client. You explain civil litigation is anticipated by the sheriff’s office as a result of the requestor’s letter. Thus, you state on the date the sheriff’s office received the request for information, the sheriff’s office reasonably anticipated litigation. Based on your representations and our review, we find the sheriff’s office reasonably anticipated litigation on the date the request was received. You also state, and we agree, the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Accordingly, the sheriff’s office may generally withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note, however, the information at issue involves alleged criminal activity. Information normally found on the front page of an offense or incident report is generally considered public. *Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist] 1975), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976); *see* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). This office has stated basic information about a crime may not be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code, even if it is related to litigation. Open Records Decision No. 362 (1983). Thus, we find the basic offense information from the arrest report may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.103. Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-187; *see also* ORD 127. Therefore, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the sheriff’s office may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing parties in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, the sheriff's office must release the requestor's client's fingerprints pursuant to section 560.002 of the Government Code. The sheriff's office must release the court-filed documents, which we have marked, pursuant to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. With the exception of basic information, the sheriff's office may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

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,



Joseph Keeney  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JDK/dls

---

<sup>3</sup>We note the requestor has a right of access beyond that of the general public to some of the information being released. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect person's privacy interests); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual asks governmental body to provide him with information concerning himself).

Ref: ID# 595280

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)