



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 1, 2007

Mr. Barry L. Macha
Criminal District Attorney
Wichita County Courthouse
900 Seventh Street
Wichita Falls, Texas 76301-2482

OR2007-14344

Dear Mr. Macha:

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# 294733.

The Wichita County Sheriff (the "sheriff") received a request for information pertaining to the confinement of the requestor's client in the Wichita County detention facilities. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.147 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.¹ We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note that the submitted information contains information that is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Under section 552.022(a)(1), a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body is expressly public unless it either is excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is expressly confidential under other law. Under section 552.022(a)(3), information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds

¹We assume that, to the extent any additional responsive information existed when the sheriff received the request for information, you have released it to the requestor. If not, then you must do so immediately. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, 552.301, 552.302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000).

by a governmental body is expressly public unless it is expressly confidential under other law. Although you assert this information is excepted under section 552.103 of the Government Code, this section is a discretionary exception under the Act, and does not constitute "other law" for purposes of section 552.022. *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. 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived). Accordingly, the sheriff may not withhold these documents under section 552.103.

We next note that the submitted information contains medical records of the requestor's client, access to which is governed by the Medical Practice Act ("MPA"). Occ. Code §§ 151.001-165.160. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in part as follows:

(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.

Id. § 159.002(b), (c). 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. *Id.* §§ 159.004, 159.005. Any subsequent release of medical records must be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. *See id.* § 159.002(c); Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). We have marked the portion of the submitted information that constitutes medical records and that may only be released in accordance with the MPA. Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991).

The submitted information also contains the fingerprints of the requestor's client. Chapter 560 of the Government Code provides that a governmental body may not release fingerprint information except in certain limited circumstances. *See Gov't Code* §§ 560.001 (defining "biometric identifier" to include fingerprints), 560.002 (prescribing manner in which biometric identifiers must be maintained and circumstances in which they can be released), 560.003 (biometric identifiers in possession of governmental body exempt from disclosure under the Act). The submitted fingerprint information is confidential under section 560.003; however, the requestor has a special right of access to her client's fingerprint information. *See id.* § 560.002(1). Therefore, the department must release this information, a representative sample of which we have marked, pursuant to section 560.002.

You assert the remaining information is excepted under section 552.103 of the Government Code, which provides in part 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). The 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 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, 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).

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *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.² 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

²In 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).

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). Based on your representations and our review of the submitted documents, we conclude you have not established that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the sheriff received the request for information. Therefore, the sheriff may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.103.

You assert that some of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Criminal history record information (“CHRI”) generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center is confidential. Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI that states obtain from the federal government or other states. *See* ORD 565. The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual law with respect to CHRI it generates. *Id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI that the Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains, except that the DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 411.083.

Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI, but a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Other entities specified in chapter 411 of the Government Code are entitled to obtain CHRI from DPS or another criminal justice agency; however, those entities may not release CHRI except as provided by chapter 411. *See generally id.* §§ 411.090-411.127. Thus, any CHRI generated by the federal government or another state may not be made available to the requestor except in accordance with federal regulations. *See* Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). Therefore, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency in the information at issue must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with chapter 411 of the Government Code and federal law.³

You assert that information pertaining to the requestor’s client is also excepted under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and section 552.147 of the Government Code. However, the person to whom such information relates or the person’s authorized representative has a right of access to such information under section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a) (“a person or a person’s authorized representative has a special right of access, beyond the right of the general public, to information held by a governmental body that relates to the person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person’s privacy

³We note that the requestor can obtain her client’s CHRI from DPS. Gov’t Code § 411.083(b)(3).

interests.”); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning herself). The requestor is the representative of the individual at issue; therefore, the requestor has a right of access to her client’s information in the remaining documents. Gov’t Code § 552.023(a).

To conclude, the marked medical records may only be released in accordance with the MPA. The sheriff must withhold any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency in the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with chapter 411 of the Government Code and federal law. The sheriff must release the remaining information.⁴

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); *Texas Dep’t of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

⁴The sheriff must again seek a decision from this office if it receives a request for this information from a different requestor.

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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/jh

Ref: ID# 294733

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Debora Dorman
Bellinger & DeWolf, LLP
10000 North Central Expressway, Suite 900
Dallas, Texas 75231
(w/o enclosures)