



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 10, 2008

Ms. Cynthia S. Martinez
Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority
2910 East Fifth Street
Austin, Texas 78702

OR2008-13972

Dear Ms. Martinez:

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#324382.

The Capital Metropolitan Transportation Authority ("Capital Metro") received a request for a full report and all other information relating to a specific bus accident. You claim that the submitted 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 some of the submitted documents constitute the requestor's client's medical records. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the Medical Practice Act (the "MPA"), chapter 159 of the Occupations Code, which governs access to medical records. Section 159.002 of the Occupations Code provides in pertinent part:

(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.

Occ. Code § 159.002(b), (c). 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). Further, information that is subject to the MPA also includes information that was obtained from medical records. *See* Occ. Code § 159.002(a)-(c); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991).

We have marked the records that are subject to the MPA. As the attorney representing the individual who is the subject of these records, the requestor may have a right of access to the medical records. These medical records must be released to the requestor on receipt of a signed, written consent from the requestor's client, 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. *See* Occ. Code §§ 159.004, .005. Any subsequent release of medical records must be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. *See* Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). If this consent is not received, the medical records must be withheld from disclosure pursuant to the MPA and section 552.101 of the Government Code.

We also note that the submitted information includes documents that are subject to 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[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information contains a completed report made by Capital Metro, which is expressly public under section 552.022(a)(1). A completed report must be released under section 552.022(a)(1) unless the information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 or expressly confidential under other law. Although you claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure 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); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Accordingly, Capital Metro may not

withhold the information subject to section 552.022, which we have marked, under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note, however, that the information subject to section 552.022 contains information subject to sections 552.130 and 552.137 of the Government Code.¹ Section 552.130 excepts 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. Accordingly, Capital Metro must withhold the Texas driver’s license information we have marked pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Under section 552.137, a governmental body may disclose the e-mail address of a member of the general public if the individual to whom the e-mail address belongs has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. *See id.* § 552.137(b). You do not inform us that the member of the public has affirmatively consented to the release of her e-mail address. Further, the e-mail address at issue does not fall within any of the exceptions to section 552.137. Thus, Capital Metro must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137.

We will now address your claim under section 552.103 in 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.

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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 satisfy 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 establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated that, when a governmental body receives a notice of claim letter, it can meet its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated by representing that the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act (the “TTCA”), Civil Practice & Remedies Code, chapter 101, 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.

The submitted documents contain a notice of claim letter from the requestor, which alleges that Capital Metro is responsible for the injuries sustained to his client. The notice of claim was received by Capital Metro prior to its receipt of the current request for information. Although you do not affirmatively represent that the claim letter meets the requirements of the TTCA, based upon our review of the submitted information and the totality of the circumstances, we find that Capital Metro reasonably anticipated litigation on the date that it received this request for information. We also find that the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation. Therefore, we determine that section 552.103 is generally applicable to the information at issue.

We note, however, that the opposing party in the anticipated litigation has seen or had access to some of the information at issue. The purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information relating to litigation through discovery procedures. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5. Thus, if the opposing party has seen or had access to information relating to litigation, through discovery or otherwise, then there is no interest in withholding such information from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). To the extent the opposing party has seen or had access to the information at issue, it is not protected by section 552.103 and may not be withheld on that basis. To the extent the

opposing party has not seen or had access to the information at issue, Capital Metro may withhold it under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We note that the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends when the litigation has concluded or is no longer anticipated. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 at 2 (1982); Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2 (1982).

In summary, the marked medical records may only be released pursuant to the MPA. With the exception of the documents subject to section 552.022 and documents seen by the opposing party, Capital Metro may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Capital Metro must withhold the Texas driver's license information and e-mail address we have marked in the documents subject to section 552.022 under sections 552.130 and 552.137 of the Government Code, respectively. The remaining information must be released.

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.

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,



Christina Alvarado
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CA/jb

Ref: ID#324382

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Kevin O. Henrichson
Byrd, Davis, Furman, L.L.P.
707 West 34th Street
Austin, Texas 78705-1294
(w/o enclosures)