



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 4, 2010

Ms. Donna L. Clarke
Assistant Criminal District Attorney
Lubbock County
P. O. Box 10536
Lubbock, Texas 79408-3536

OR2010-00036

Dear Ms. Clarke:

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# 366243.

The Lubbock County Criminal District Attorney (the "district attorney") received a request for all information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.108 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the submitted information includes a CR-3 accident report form that was 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. *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. *Id.* In this instance, the requestor has provided the district attorney with two of the three pieces of information pursuant to section 550.065(c)(4). As a general rule, the exceptions found in the Act do not apply to information that is made public by other statutes. *See* Open Records Division No. 525 (1989) (statutory predecessor). Therefore, the district attorney must release the accident report form, which we have marked, to this requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c)(4) of the Transportation Code.

We now address your arguments against disclosure of the remaining information. Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 360 (Tex. 2000); Open Records Decision No. 677 at 4-8 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines work product as:

- (1) material prepared or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial by or for a party or a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees, or agents; or
- (2) a communication made in anticipation of litigation or for trial between a party and the party’s representatives or among a party’s representatives, including the party’s attorneys, consultants, sureties, indemnitors, insurers, employees or agents.

TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5. A governmental body seeking to withhold information under this exception bears the burden of demonstrating that the information was created or developed for trial or in anticipation of litigation by or for a party or a party’s representative. *Id.*; ORD 677 at 6-8. In order for this office to conclude that the information was made or developed in anticipation of litigation, we must be satisfied that:

- a) a reasonable person would have concluded from the totality of the circumstances surrounding the investigation that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue; and b) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and [created or obtained the information] for the purpose of preparing for such litigation.

Nat’l Tank Co. v. Brotherton, 851 S.W.2d 193, 207 (Tex. 1993). A “substantial chance” of litigation does not mean a statistical probability, but rather “that litigation is more than merely an abstract possibility or unwarranted fear.” *Id.* at 204; ORD 677 at 7.

The work product doctrine is applicable to litigation files in criminal and civil litigation. *Curry v. Walker*, 873 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. 1994); see *U.S. v. Nobles*, 422 U.S. 225, 236 (1975). In *Curry*, the Texas Supreme Court held that a request for a district attorney's "entire file" was "too broad" and, citing *National Union Fire Insurance Co. v. Valdez*, 863 S.W.2d 458, 460 (Tex. 1993), held that "the decision as to what to include in [the file] necessarily reveals the attorney's thought processes concerning the prosecution or defense of the case."¹ *Id.* at 380. Accordingly, if a requestor seeks an attorney's entire litigation file, and a governmental body seeks to withhold the entire file and demonstrates that the file was created in anticipation of litigation, we will presume that the entire file is excepted from disclosure under the attorney work product aspect of section 552.111. Open Records Decision No. 647 at 5 (1996); see *Nat'l Union Fire Ins. Co. v Valdez*, 863 S.W.2d 458, 461 (Tex. 1993) (organization of attorney's litigation file necessarily reflects attorney's thought processes).

You indicate that the request for information encompasses the district attorney's entire file concerning the case at issue. You state that the information at issue was compiled by the district attorney in preparation for trial and represents the district attorney's mental impressions and legal reasoning. Based on these representations and our review, we conclude that the district attorney may withhold the remaining information as attorney work-product under section 552.111 of the Government Code.²

In summary, (1) the district attorney must release the accident report form, which we have marked, to this requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c)(4) of the Transportation Code; and (2) the district attorney may withhold the remaining information as attorney work-product under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.


This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public

¹We note, however, that the court in *National Union* also concluded that a specific document is not automatically considered to be privileged simply because it is part of an attorney's file. 863 S.W.2d 458, 461 (Tex. 1993). The court held that an opposing party may request specific documents or categories of documents that are relevant to the case without implicating the attorney work product privilege. *Id.*; Open Records Decision No. 647 at 5 (1996).

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely;

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Chris Sterner".

Christopher D. Sterner
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CDSA/eb

Ref: ID# 366243

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)