



April 25, 2002

Ms. Tamara Pitts
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
1000 Throckmorton Street
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2002-2122

Dear Ms. Pitts:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID#161807.

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for various information pertaining to the officer who issued a traffic citation to the requestor. You assert that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that a portion of the submitted materials includes information made public by section 552.022 of the Government Code. This section provides several categories of information that are not excepted from required disclosure unless they "are expressly confidential under other law." In pertinent part this section reads:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108;

...

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted materials in Exhibits E and E-1 include completed reports that are subject to required release under section 552.022(a)(1) unless they are expressly confidential under other law or are excepted under section 552.108. You contend that sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code make this information confidential. Sections 552.103 and 552.107 are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect the governmental body's interests and are therefore not other law that makes information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a). *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469 (Tex. App.–Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision No. 522 at 4 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). Accordingly, we do not address your section 552.103 and 552.107 arguments with respect to these reports.

However, the attorney-client privilege is also found in Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. Recently, the Texas Supreme Court held that “[t]he Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and Texas Rules of Evidence are ‘other law’ within the meaning of section 552.022.” *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001). Thus, we will determine whether the information is confidential under Rule 503.

Rule 503(b)(1) provides:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or a representative of the client and the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer;

(B) between the layer and the lawyer's representative;

(C) by the client or a representative of the client, or the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or a representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein;

(D) between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

A communication is “confidential” if not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal

services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication. Tex. R. Evid. 503(a)(5).

Accordingly, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under Rule 503, a governmental body must 1) show that the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; 2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and 3) show that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the document containing privileged information is confidential under Rule 503 provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in Rule 503(d). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

Upon review of your arguments under the attorney-client privilege, we conclude that you have not established that the reports in Exhibit E subject to disclosure under section 552.022(a)(1) are protected under Rule 503. As you raise no other exceptions to disclosure for the reports in Exhibit E, we conclude that this information, which we have marked, must be released to the requestor, with the following exception.

Section 552.130 provides in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from the requirement of Section 552.021 if the information relates to:

- (1) a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state; [or]
- (2) a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state[.]

You must withhold the Texas license plate numbers we have marked under section 552.130.

With regard to the information in Exhibit E-1 that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1), you also claim that section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts this information from public disclosure. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure information deemed confidential by statute, such as section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. We understand that the city is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089 contemplates two different types of personnel files, a police officer's civil service file that the police department is required to maintain, and an internal file that the police department may maintain for its own use. Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a), (g). In cases in which a police department takes disciplinary action against a police officer, it is required by section 143.089(a)(2) to place records relating to the investigation and disciplinary action in

the officer's civil service file maintained under section 143.089(a). Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. *See Id.* §§ 143.051-.055. Such records are subject to release under chapter 552 of the Government Code. *See Id.* § 143.089(f); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 6 (1990).

However, a document relating to an officer's alleged misconduct may not be placed in his civil service personnel file if there is insufficient evidence to sustain the charge of misconduct. Local Gov't Code § 143.089(b). Information that reasonably relates to an officer's employment relationship with the police department and that is maintained in a police department's internal file pursuant to section 143.089(g) is confidential and must not be released. *City of San Antonio v. San Antonio Express-News*, 47 S.W.3d 556 (Tex. App.--San Antonio 2000, pet. denied); *City of San Antonio v. Texas Attorney General*, 851 S.W.2d 946, 949 (Tex. App.--Austin 1993, writ denied).

You state that the city maintains the information you have submitted as Exhibit E-1 in the police department's internal file pursuant to section 143.089(g). We therefore conclude that the information we have marked in Exhibit E-1 that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code is confidential pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code and must be withheld under section 552.101.

For the remainder of the submitted information, we will address your argument under section 552.103. Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in relevant 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). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish that section 552.103 is applicable to the information at issue. The governmental body must demonstrate: (1) that litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information and (2) that the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas 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.); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). Both parts of the test must be met in order for information to be withheld under this exception. *Id.*

You inform this office that the information at issue relates to a prosecution in the city's municipal court for a traffic citation. You indicate that the case was pending on the date of receipt of this request for information. You also state that a moving violation is a criminal charge brought against a violator by the city on behalf of the state of Texas, and thus, the city is a party to litigation of a criminal nature. Based on your representations and the documentation you provided, we find that the city was a party to pending litigation when this request for information was received. We also find that the requested information relates to the pending litigation. We therefore conclude that the city may withhold most of the remaining requested information at this time under section 552.103.

Generally, however, 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). Further, 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 party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. In this regard, we note that the submitted information in Exhibit C contains a copy of the traffic citation issued to the requestor. As the requestor has had access to this document, it may not be withheld under section 552.103. For this document, we will address your argument under section 552.107.

Section 552.107(1) excepts information that an attorney cannot disclose because of a duty to his client. In Open Records Decision No. 574 (1990), this office concluded that section 552.107 excepts from public disclosure only "privileged information," that is, information that reflects either confidential communications from the client to the attorney or the attorney's legal advice or opinions; it does not apply to all client information held by a governmental body's attorney. Open Records Decision No. 574 at 5 (1990). Upon review of your arguments in support of your 552.107 assertion, we conclude you have not demonstrated that the citation is protected under the attorney-client privilege. Therefore, we conclude you may not withhold this document under section 552.107.

You also assert that this information is protected as attorney work product. A governmental body may withhold attorney work product from disclosure under section 552.111 if it demonstrates that the material was 1) created for trial or in anticipation of civil litigation, and 2) consists of or tends to reveal an attorney's mental processes, conclusions and legal theories. Open Records Decision No. 647 (1996). The first prong of the work product test, which requires a governmental body to show that the information at issue was created in anticipation of litigation, has two parts. A governmental body must demonstrate that 1) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding

the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue, and 2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and conducted the investigation for the purpose of preparing for such litigation. Open Records Decision No. 647 at 4 (1996). The second prong of the work product test requires the governmental body to show that the documents at issue tend to reveal the attorney's mental processes, conclusions, and legal theories. Upon review of your arguments, we conclude you have not established that the citation at issue is protected as attorney work product. Therefore, we conclude that the submitted copy of the citation, which we have marked, must be released to the requestor.

We note that included among the documents you seek to withhold are accident report forms that appear to have been completed pursuant to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. *See* Transp. Code § 550.064 (officer's accident report). Section 550.065(b) states that except as provided by subsection (c), accident reports are privileged and confidential. The Seventy-seventh Legislature amended section 550.065(c)(4) to provide for release of accident reports to a person who provides two of the following three pieces of information: (1) date of the accident; (2) name of any person involved in the accident; and (3) specific location of the accident. *See* Act of May 22, 2001, 77th Leg., R.S., H.B. 1544, § 5 (to be codified at Transp. Code § 550.065(c)(4)). Under this provision, the Department of Public Safety or another governmental entity is required to release a copy of an accident report to a person who provides the agency with two or more pieces of information specified by the statute. *Id.* In the situation at hand, the requestor has not provided the department with two of the three pieces of information. Thus, you must withhold the accident reports under section 550.065(b) in conjunction with section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Finally, you request a "previous determination" from this office that would be applicable to future requests for information subject to Chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. We decline to issue such a previous determination at this time.

To summarize, the city may withhold all of the submitted information under section 552.103, with the exception of the copy of the traffic citation in Exhibit C, the accident reports, and certain information in Exhibits E and E-1, which is subject to disclosure under section 552.022(a)(1). The traffic citation must be released to the requestor. The accident reports are confidential under section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code and therefore excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. The information in Exhibit E-1 that is subject to disclosure under section 552.022(a)(1) is confidential under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code, and is therefore excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. The information in Exhibit E subject to disclosure under section 552.022(a)(1) must be released to the requestor, with the license plate numbers we have marked redacted pursuant to section 552.130.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code

§ 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Michael A. Pearle
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MAP/seg

Ref: ID# 161807

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. John Charles
316 Revere Street
Fort Worth, Texas 76134
(w/o enclosures)