



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 14, 2004

Mr. James M. Frazier, III
Assistant General Counsel
Texas Department of Criminal Justice
P.O. Box 4004
Huntsville, Texas 77342

OR2004-10601

Dear Mr. Frazier:

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# 214813.

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to an incident involving a former inmate, including incident reports, witness statements and photographs. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.117 and 552.134 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the submitted documents include multiple copies of a Texas Peace Officer's Accident Report Form ST-3 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. 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 this instance, the requestor has provided the department with all three of the

pieces of information specified in the statute. Thus, the department must release the submitted copies of the accident report to the requestor. *See also* Open Records Decision No. 623 at 3 (1994) (exceptions to public disclosure under chapter 552 of Government Code generally do not apply to information that another statute expressly makes public).

Section 552.134 of the Government Code provides in relevant part:

(a) Except as provided by Subsection (b) or by Section 552.029, information obtained or maintained by the [department] is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if it is information about an inmate who is confined in a facility operated by or under a contract with the department.

Gov't Code § 552.134(a). Section 552.134 is explicitly made subject to section 552.029 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.134(a). Section 552.029 provides that, notwithstanding section 552.134, eight specified categories of "information about an inmate who is confined in a facility operated by or under a contract with [the department are] subject to required disclosure[.]" *See* Gov't Code § 552.029. Specifically, one of these categories subject to required disclosure provides as follows:

(1) the inmate's name, identification number, age, birthplace, physical description, or general state of health or the nature of an injury to or critical illness suffered by the inmate[.]

Gov't Code § 552.029(1). On review, we find that the majority of the submitted records constitute information about a former inmate who was confined in a facility operated by the department. We also note that these records relate to an inmate who was injured. While the majority of this information must be withheld under section 552.134, the nature of the inmate's injury may not be withheld under section 552.134. In addition, we find that a portion of the submitted information is not about an inmate. Therefore, we will address your argument under section 552.103 for the information not excepted under section 552.134.

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.

The department has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden 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, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *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). The department must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a 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. Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). 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.

You state that the department has received a Notice of Claim in compliance with statutory notice requirements of a pending tort claim, alleging negligence on the part of the department with respect to the accident at issue. You inform us that the department received the Notice of Claim prior to the date it received the request for information. Therefore, we conclude that the department reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the request for information. We also find that the remaining information relates to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Accordingly, the department may withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.103(a).¹

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 party 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).

¹Because we reach this conclusion, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

In summary, the department must release the submitted copies of the accident report pursuant to section 550.065(c)(4) of the Transportation Code. We have marked the information that the department may withhold under section 552.103. The department must withhold the remaining submitted information under section 552.134.

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 Dep't of Pub. 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,



Marc A. Barenblat
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MAB/sdk

Ref: ID# 214813

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Barry G. Johnson
Law Office of James M. Stanley
2200 Hemphill Street
Fort Worth, Texas 76110
(w/o enclosures)