



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

February 28, 2005

Mr. Mark G. Mann  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Garland  
P.O. Box 469002  
Garland, Texas 75046-9002

OR2005-01718

Dear Mr. Mann:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 219339.

The City of Garland (the "city") received a request for information regarding accidents or incidents related to injuries caused by man-hole covers on city sidewalks near the city square. 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 the submitted information contains emergency medical services ("EMS") records. Access to EMS records is governed by the provisions of section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). Section 773.091 provides:

(b) Records of the identity, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by emergency medical services personnel or by a physician providing medical supervision that are created by the emergency medical services personnel or physician or maintained by an emergency medical services provider are confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

....

(g) The privilege of confidentiality under this section does not extend to information regarding the presence, nature of injury or illness, age, sex, occupation, and city of residence of a patient who is receiving emergency medical services. . . .

Health & Safety Code § 773.091(b), (g). Thus, except for the information specified in section 773.091(g), EMS records are deemed confidential under section 773.091 and, therefore, may only be released in accordance with chapter 773 of the Health and Safety Code. *See* Health & Safety Code §§ 773.091-.094. We note, however, that records that are confidential under section 773.091 may be disclosed to “any person who bears a written consent of the patient or other persons authorized to act on the patient’s behalf for the release of confidential information.” Health & Safety Code §§ 773.092(e)(4), .093. Section 773.093 provides that a consent for release of EMS records must specify: (1) the information or records to be covered by the release; (2) the reasons or purpose for the release; and (3) the person to whom the information is to be released. We have marked the EMS records that are subject to chapter 773 of the Health and Safety Code. If section 773.092 applies in this instance, the city must release these marked EMS records to the requestor. *See* Health & Safety Code §§ 773.092, .093; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 632 (1995). Otherwise, the city must withhold these marked EMS records pursuant to section 773.091(b) of the Health and Safety Code, except for the information in these records that is not confidential under section 773.091(g).

We now address your section 552.103 claim with regard to the remaining submitted information. Section 552.103 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 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 on the date the governmental body receives the request for

information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. See *Thomas v. Cornyn*, 71 S.W.3d 473, 487 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. 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 governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

In order 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”), chapter 101 of the Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code, or an applicable municipal ordinance. If a governmental body does not make this representation, the claim letter is a factor that this office will consider in determining whether a governmental body has established that litigation is reasonably anticipated based on the totality of the circumstances.

You assert that the city reasonably anticipates litigation relating to the subject of the present request. You state and provide documentation showing that, on the date you received this request for information, the city also received a claim letter and a notice of claim for damages caused to the requestor’s client when she stepped on a defective man-hole cover. You do not affirmatively represent to this office that the requestor’s letter is in compliance with the TTCA. However, after having reviewed the submitted documentation and your arguments, we conclude, based on the totality of the circumstances, that litigation was reasonably anticipated on the date the city received this request for information. Furthermore, we find that the remaining submitted information is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). We therefore conclude that the remaining submitted information may be withheld from disclosure 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). Thus, responsive information to which all of the parties in the anticipated litigation have had access is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has concluded or is no longer reasonably anticipated. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, if section 773.092 of the Health and Safety Code applies in this instance, the city must release the EMS records that we have marked to the requestor. Otherwise, with the exception of the information in these records that is not confidential under section 773.091(g), the city must withhold these marked EMS records pursuant to section 773.091(b) of the Health and Safety Code. The city may withhold the remaining submitted information, including the information in the marked EMS records that is not confidential under section 773.091(g), under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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); *Tex. 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,



Lauren E. Kleine  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LEK/jev

Ref: ID# 219339

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Hector Salinas  
Adrian Crane and Associates, P.C.  
8111 LBJ Freeway, Suite 1065  
Dallas, Texas 75251  
(w/o enclosures)