



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 22, 2011

Ms. Carolyn Foster
Deputy General Counsel
Parkland Health & Hospital System
5201 Harry Hines Boulevard
Dallas, Texas 75235

OR2011-13697

Dear Ms. Foster:

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# 430690.

The Dallas County Hospital District d/b/a Parkland Health and Hospital System (the “district”) received a request for certain statements, photographs, reports, and appraisals related to an incident involving the requestor’s client. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to sections 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note the submitted information includes a CR-3 report completed pursuant to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. *See* Transp. Code § 550.064 (officer’s accident report). Section 550.065(b) states, except as provided by subsection (c) or subsection (e), accident reports are privileged and confidential. *Id.* § 550.065(b). However, section 550.065(c)(4) provides for 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

¹We assume that the “representative sample” of information submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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.² In this instance, the requestor has provided the district with two of the three specified pieces of information pursuant to section 550.065(c)(4). Although you seek to withhold this information under section 552.117 of the Government Code, we note a statutory right of access generally prevails over the exceptions to public disclosure under the Act. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 623 at 3 (1994) (exceptions in Act inapplicable to information statutes expressly make public), 613 at 4 (1993) (exceptions in Act cannot impinge on statutory right of access to information), 451 (1986) (specific statutory right of access provisions overcome general exception to disclosure under the Act). Accordingly, the submitted CR-3 report in Exhibit F must be released in its entirety pursuant to section 550.065(c)(4) of the Transportation Code.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in relevant 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). 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 was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *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

²See Transp. Code § 550.0601 ("department" means Texas Department of Transportation).

n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

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). 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.³ 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 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). This office has concluded a governmental body’s receipt of a claim letter it represents to be in compliance with the notice requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act (the “TTCA”), chapter 101 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code, is sufficient to establish litigation is reasonably anticipated. If that representation is not made, the receipt of the claim letter is a factor we will consider in determining, from the totality of the circumstances presented, whether the governmental body has established litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 638 at 4 (1996). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* ORD 452 at 4.

You state the district reasonably anticipates litigation involving the requestor’s client in this instance because the district received a letter containing a notice of claim on the date it received the present request for information. You state the claim letter complies with the requirements of the TTCA. Further, you state the information in Exhibits B, D, and E pertains to the subject of the anticipated litigation. Based on your representations, we conclude the district reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Further, we find the information at issue relates to the anticipated litigation. Accordingly, the district may withhold the information in Exhibits B, D, and E under section 552.103 of the Government Code.⁴

We note, however, once the information has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision No. 349 at 2 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from

³Among other examples, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated where the opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: (1) filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); (2) 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 (3) threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

or provided to the city's opposing party in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103, and it must be disclosed. We note the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends when the litigation has concluded or is no longer anticipated. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982) at 2; Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2.

In summary, the district must release the submitted CR-3 report in Exhibit F pursuant to section 550.065(c)(4) of the Transportation Code. The district may withhold the information in Exhibits B, D, and E under section 552.103 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 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,



Jennifer Burnett
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JB/dls

Ref: ID# 430690

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)