



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 30, 2012

Ms. Debbie F. Harrison  
Assistant District Attorney  
Special Crimes Division - Civil Section  
Collin County  
2100 Bloomdale Road, Suite 100  
McKinney, Texas 75071

OR2012-06179

Dear Ms. Harrison:

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# 452095.

The Collin County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") received a request for all information related to a specified incident. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.108, 552.111, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information contains a CR-3 accident report form completed pursuant to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. *See* Transp. Code § 550.064 (officer's accident report). Section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code states that except as provided by subsection (c) or subsection (e), accident reports are privileged and for the confidential use of certain specified entities. *Id.* § 550.065(b). 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) the date of the accident; (2) the name of any person involved in the accident; and (3) the specific location of the accident. *Id.* § 550.065(c)(4). Under this provision, a governmental entity is required to release a copy of an accident report to a person who provides two or more pieces of information specified by the statute. *Id.* In this instance, the requestor has provided the district attorney's office with the requisite pieces of information. Although you seek to withhold this information under sections 552.103, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code, statutes governing the release of specific information prevail over the general exceptions to disclosure found in the

Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 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 exceptions to disclosure under the Act).

You also raise section 552.130 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title, or registration issued by an agency of this state or another state or county. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1)-(2). As noted above, a statutory right of access generally prevails over the Act's general exceptions to disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 623 at 3 (1994) (exceptions in Act inapplicable to information that 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). However, because section 552.130 has its own access provisions, we conclude section 552.130 is not a general exception under the Act. Thus, we must address the conflict between the access provided under section 550.065 of the Transportation Code and the confidentiality provided under section 552.130. Where information falls within both a general and a specific provision of law, the specific provision prevails over the general. *See Horizon/CMS Healthcare Corp. v. Auld*, 34 S.W.3d 887, 901 (Tex. 2000) ("more specific statute controls over the more general"); *Cuellar v. State*, 521 S.W.2d 277 (Tex. Crim. App. 1975) (under well-established rule of statutory construction, specific statutory provisions prevail over general ones); Open Records Decision Nos. 598 (1991), 583 (1990), 451 (1986).

In this instance, section 550.065 specifically provides access only to accident reports of the type at issue in this request, while section 552.130 generally excepts motor vehicle record information maintained in any context. Thus, we conclude the access to accident reports provided under section 550.065 is more specific than the general confidentiality provided under section 552.130. Accordingly, the district attorney's office may not withhold any portion of the CR-3 form under section 552.130. Therefore, the district attorney's office must release the CR-3 accident report form in its entirety to the requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c)(4).

Next, we note the remaining information includes documents filed with a court, which we have marked. Section 552.022 of the Government Code provides for required public disclosure of "information that is also contained in a public court record," unless the information is made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). Although the district attorney's office seeks to withhold this information under sections 552.103, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code, these sections are discretionary exceptions to disclosure and do not make information confidential under the Act. *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. 677 at 10 (2002) (attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 177 at 3 (1977)

(statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). Therefore, the district attorney's office may not withhold the marked court-filed documents under section 552.103, section 552.108, or section 552.111. The Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022 of the Government Code. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). However, the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure apply only to "actions of a civil nature." *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 2. Thus, because the submitted information relates to a criminal case, the attorney work product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure does not apply in this instance. However, you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code, which makes information confidential under the Act. Therefore, we will consider the applicability of this exception to the information subject to section 552.022. We will also address your arguments for the remainder of the submitted information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code 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 made confidential by other statutes, such as section 560.003 of the Government Code, which provides that "[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under [the Act]." *Id.* § 560.003; *see also id.* §§ 560.001(1) (defining "biometric identifier" to include fingerprints), .002(1)(A) (governmental body may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose individual's biometric identifier to another person unless individual consents to disclosure). Therefore, the district attorney's office must withhold the fingerprints we have marked in the court-filed documents under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup>

We next address your arguments against disclosure of the remaining information not subject to section 552.022 the Government Code. Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]" *Id.* § 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

---

<sup>1</sup>We note you raise sections 559.001, 559.002, and 559.003 of the Government Code for fingerprint information. These sections were renumbered as chapter 560 by the Seventy-eighth Legislature. *See* Act of May 20, 2003, 78th Leg., R.S., ch. 1275, § 2 (78), 2003 Tex. Gen. Laws 4140, 4144.

(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 under section 552.111 of the Government Code 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."<sup>2</sup> *Id.* at 380. Accordingly, if a requestor seeks an attorney's entire litigation file, and a governmental body 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*, 863 S.W.2d at 461 (organization of attorney's litigation file necessarily reflects attorney's thought processes).

You contend the request for information encompasses the district attorney's office's entire prosecution files concerning four cases arising out of the same incident. Upon review, we

---

<sup>2</sup>We note, however, 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 at 461. The court held 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).

determine the district attorney's office may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 as attorney work-product under section 552.111 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

In summary, the district attorney's office must release the CR-3 accident report form in its entirety to the requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c)(4) of the Transportation Code. The district attorney's office must release the court-filed documents we have marked; however, the district attorney's office must withhold the fingerprints we have marked in the court-filed documents under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code. The district attorney's office may withhold the remaining information 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](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# 452095

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.