



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 18, 2008

Mr. Casey S. Erick
Fletcher, Farley, Krueger, Shipman & Salinas, L.L.P.
8750 North Central Expressway, 16th Floor
Dallas, Texas 75231

OR2008-11241

Dear Mr. Erick:

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# 319348.

The City of Balch Springs (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for seven categories of information relating to a fatal traffic accident. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note that the submitted information includes a CRB-3 accident report form completed pursuant to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. *See* Transp. Code § 550.064. Section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code 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. *Id.* § 550.065(c)(4). Under this provision, the Texas Department of Transportation 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.¹ *Id.* In this case, the requestor has provided the information specified by the statute. Accordingly, the CRB-3 accident report form in the submitted information must be released to the requestor.

Next, we note that some the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(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;

...

(18) a settlement agreement to which a governmental body is a party[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1), (18). The submitted information contains completed investigations and completed reports made by and for the city, all of which are expressly public under section 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information also contains a settlement agreement between the city and the named officer, which is expressly public under section 552.022(a)(18). The city raises sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.103 for this information. Section 552.103 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *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 Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). As such, section 552.103 does not qualify as "other law" that makes information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, the city may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.101 and 552.102 are "other law" for the purpose of section 552.022. Therefore, we will address your arguments under these sections for the information subject to section 552.022.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 143.089(g) of the Local

¹Transp. Code § 550.0601 ("department" means Texas Department of Transportation).

Government Code. This section applies to cities that are civil service cities under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code.² Section 143.089 contemplates two different types of personnel files: a file that must be maintained by a city's civil service director or the director's designee, and another file that may be maintained by a city's police department for its own use. Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a), (g). In cases in which a police department investigates a police officer's misconduct and takes disciplinary action against the police officer, section 143.089(a)(2) requires the department to place all investigatory records relating to the investigation and disciplinary action, including background documents such as complaints, witness statements, and documents of like nature from individuals who were not in a supervisory capacity, in the police officer's civil service file maintained under section 143.089(a). *Abbott v. City of Corpus Christi*, 109 S.W.3d 113, 122 (Tex. App.—Austin 2003, no pet.). All investigatory materials in a case resulting in disciplinary action are "from the employing department" when they are held by or in possession of a department because of its investigation into a police officer's misconduct, and the department must forward them to the civil service commission for placement in the civil service personnel file. *Id.* Such records are subject to release under chapter 552 of the Government Code. *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(f); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 6 (1990). However, information maintained in a police department's personnel file pursuant to section 43.089(g) is confidential and must not be released. *City of San Antonio v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 851 S.W.2d 946, 949 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied).

You indicate that the completed investigation and settlement agreement at issue are subject to section 143.089(g) and thus, confidential under section 552.101 of the Government Code. However, you do not inform us that this information is held in a file maintained by the city's police department under section 143.089(g). Furthermore, we note that all investigatory materials relating to an investigation that resulted in disciplinary action must be held in the officer's civil service file. *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a); *See also Abbott v. Corpus Christi*, 109 S.W.3d at 122. Therefore, none of the submitted information may be withheld on this basis.

Section 552.101 also encompasses chapter 55 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Articles 55.01 through 55.05 of the Code of Criminal Procedure provide for the expunction of criminal records in certain limited circumstances. Article 55.03 prescribes the effect of an expunction order and provides:

When the order of expunction is final:

- (1) the release, maintenance, dissemination, or use of the expunged records and files for any purpose is prohibited;

²We understand that the city is a civil service municipality under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code.

(2) except as provided in Subdivision (3) of this article, the person arrested may deny the occurrence of the arrest and the existence of the expunction order; and

(3) the person arrested or any other person, when questioned under oath in a criminal proceeding about an arrest for which the records have been expunged, may state only that the matter in question has been expunged.

Crim. Proc. Code art. 55.03. Article 55.04 imposes sanctions for violations of an expunction order and provides in relevant part:

Sec. 1. A person who acquires knowledge of an arrest while an officer or employee of the state or of any agency or other entity of the state . . . and who knows of an order expunging the records and files relating to that arrest commits an offense if he knowingly releases, disseminates, or otherwise uses the records or files.

Id. art. 55.04, § 1. This office has previously determined that the expunction statute prevails over the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 457 at 2 (1987) (governmental body prohibited from releasing or disseminating arrest records subject to expunction order, as “those records are not subject to public disclosure under the [Act]”). Upon review, we note that a portion of the information at issue, which we have marked, pertains to expunged records that are confidential under article 55.03 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Accordingly, the information we have marked must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102 is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board* for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 683-85 (Tex. 1976). Information is protected from disclosure under the common-law right to privacy if (1) it contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) it is not of legitimate concern to the public. *See id.* at 685. The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683.

In addition, this office has found that some medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses is protected under common-law privacy. Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). We note, however, that information about a public employee's qualifications, disciplinary action and background is not protected by common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision Nos. 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has interest in public employee's qualifications and performance and the circumstances of his resignation or termination), 405 at 2-3 (1983) (public has interest in manner in which public employee performs his job), 329 at 2 (1982) (information relating to complaints against public employees and discipline resulting therefrom is not protected under former section 552.101 or 552.102), 208 at 2 (1978) (information relating to complaint against public employee and disposition of the complaint is not protected under either the constitutional or common-law right of privacy). Upon review, we find that you have failed to explain how any portion of the information at issue constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing information the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. Therefore, no portion of the information may be withheld under section 552.102 of the Government Code.

We note that some of the submitted documents contain information that is subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code.³ Section 552.130 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure "information [that] relates to . . . a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state [or] a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state." Gov't Code § 552.130. We note that section 552.130 does not encompass motor vehicle record information that pertains exclusively to a deceased individual. See Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981). In accordance with section 552.130 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information we have marked in the documents otherwise subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

You claim that the information that is not subject to section 552.022 is protected under section 552.103, which 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.

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

(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, 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 552.103(a).

You state, and provide documentation showing, that portions of the submitted information relate to a lawsuit styled *Diana Hall Austin Individually and as Administratrix of the Estate of Jimmy Wayne Hall, Deceased v. City of Balch Springs and Wal-Mart Stores Texas, L.L.C.*, Cause No. CC-08-00501, which was filed in the Dallas County Court at Law No. 3. Based on your representations and our review of the remaining submitted information, we find that the city was involved in pending litigation on the date it received the present request and that the information at issue is related to the pending litigation for the purposes of section 552.103 of the Government Code. Therefore, the city may withhold the remaining submitted information pursuant to section 552.103.

We note, however, that once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103 interest exists with respect to that information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). We also note that section 552.103 is no longer applicable to this information once the related litigation concludes. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350(1982).

In summary, the city must release the CRB-3 accident report form pursuant to section 550.065(c)(4) of the Transportation Code. With the exception of the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with article 55.03 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, as well as the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code, the city must release the documents we have marked pursuant to

section 552.022 of the Government Code.⁴ The remaining information may be withheld 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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 challenge 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 Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

⁴We note the information being released contains social security numbers. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147.

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,



Bill Longley
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BL/eeg

Ref: ID# 319348

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Houston M. Smith
210 East Moore
Terrell, Texas 75160
(w/o enclosures)