



June 4, 2002

Ms. Elizabeth Lutton
Senior Attorney
City of Arlington
P.O. Box 231
Arlington, Texas 76004-0231

OR2002-3014

Dear Ms. Lutton:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 163807.

The City of Arlington (the "city") received a request for a former employee's employment file. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that a portion of the submitted information consists of medical records, access to which is governed by the Medical Practice Act (the "MPA"), chapter 159 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides:

- (a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Information that is subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See* Occ. Code §§ 159.002, .004; Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). This office has concluded that the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982).

The medical records must be released upon the patient's signed, written consent, provided that the consent specifies (1) the information to be covered by the release, (2) reasons or purposes for the release, and (3) the person to whom the information is to be released. Occ. Code §§ 159.004, .005. Section 159.002(c) also requires that any subsequent release of medical records be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). Here, the requestor has submitted a signed consent from the subject of the submitted records. We have marked the documents that consist of medical records and are therefore subject to the MPA. This information may be released only in accordance with the MPA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). Thus, if the submitted signed consent meets the requirements of section 159.005, the documents we have marked as subject to the MPA must be released to the requestor.

Next we note that included among the documents you seek to withhold is an accident report form that appears 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. Section 550.065(c)(4) provides for the 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* 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 city with two of the three pieces of information regarding the traffic accident at issue. Thus, the city must withhold the submitted accident report, which we have marked, under section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code.

We also note that some of the submitted information is made expressly public under section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides, in relevant part

- (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[.]

The submitted information contains completed reports and evaluations, which are expressly public under section 552.022(a)(1). You do not claim that the submitted information is excepted under section 552.108. Therefore, you may only withhold the completed reports and evaluations if they are made confidential under other law. Section 552.103 of the Government Code is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects the governmental body's interests and is 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). Therefore, the city may not withhold the completed reports and evaluations, which we have marked, under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note, however, that some of the information in the completed reports that must be withheld under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 excepts from public disclosure information relating to a driver's license, license plate, or motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state. We note, however, that information protected under section 552.130 is intended to protect a person's privacy. Therefore, under section 552.023 of the Government Code, a person who is the subject of the information or the person's authorized representative has a special right of access to such information. Accordingly, the requestor here has a special right of access to his client's section 552.130 information. However, the city must withhold the remaining license plate numbers in the completed reports pursuant to section 552.130.

We now address your claim under section 552.103 of the Government Code for the remaining submitted information. Section 552.103 provides 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 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the applicability of an exception in a particular situation. The test for establishing that section 552.103(a) applies is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *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.); Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991). Section 552.103 requires concrete evidence that litigation may ensue. To demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the city must furnish evidence that litigation is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). 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.¹ Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). Further, in Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated that a governmental body has met its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter and the governmental body represents that the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act ("TTCA"), Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code, ch. 101, or an applicable municipal ordinance.

The request for information that you have submitted also contains a notice of claim from the requestor, who is an attorney. The requestor states that he has been hired by a former city employee "relevant to his claims of discrimination and retaliation in the work place." You do not state that this letter complies with the notice requirements of the TTCA or an applicable municipal ordinance or statute. Nevertheless, based on the totality of the circumstances presented here, we conclude that litigation is reasonably anticipated and that the submitted information is related to the reasonably anticipated litigation for the purposes of section 552.103. Therefore, you may withhold the remaining submitted information pursuant to section 552.103.

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). 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).

¹In 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).

To summarize: (1) if the submitted signed consent meets the requirements of section 159.005, the documents we have marked as subject to the MPA must be released to the requestor; (2) the city must withhold the submitted accident report, which we have marked, under section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code; (3) we have marked the submitted information that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1) that must be released to the requestor, with the exception of the license plate numbers that do not pertain to the requestor's client, which must be withheld under section 552.130²; and (4) the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.103.

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).

²We note that some of these documents contain confidential information that is not subject to release to the general public. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023. However, the requestor in this instance has a special right of access to the information. Gov't Code § 552.023. Because some of the information is confidential with respect to the general public, if the city receives a further request for this information from an individual other than the requestor or his authorized representative, the city should again seek our decision.

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,



Karen A. Eckerle
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAE/sdk

Ref: ID# 163807

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Don R. Stewart
200 East Main Street
Arlington, Texas 7601-1126
(w/o enclosures)