



June 24, 1999

Mr. Mark A. Flowers
Assistant City Attorney
City of Midland
P.O. Box 1152
Midland, Texas 79702-1152

OR99-1780

Dear Mr. Flowers:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Texas Public Information Act, chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 127201.

The City of Midland (the “city”) received a request for information pertaining to an automobile accident that occurred on April 1, 1999 near the 4500 block of North Lamesa Road. You assert that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of documents.¹

First, we will address the request for “any and all documents in the possession of the City of Midland, describing collisions between cars and pedestrians occurring at or within close proximity (one city block north or south) to the 4500 block of N. Lamesa Road, directly west of Christensen Stadium.” You state that the city has accident reports which are responsive to this request. You argue that the requested information is confidential under section 550.065 of the Transportation Code.

The Seventy-fifth Legislature repealed V.T.C.S. article 6701d, and amended section 550.065 of the Transportation Code concerning the disclosure of accident report information. Act of

¹In reaching our conclusion here, we assume that the “representative sample” of records 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.

May 29, 1997, 75th Leg., R.S. ch. 1187, 1997 Tex. Gen. Laws 4575, 4582-4583 (to be codified at Transp. Code § 550.065). However, a Travis County district court has issued a temporary injunction enjoining the enforcement of the amendment to section 550.065 of the Transportation Code. *Texas Daily Newspaper Ass'n, v. Morales*, No. 97-08930 (345th Dist. Ct., Travis County, Tex., Oct. 24, 1997) (second amended agreed temporary injunction). A temporary injunction preserves the status quo until the final hearing of a case on its merits. *Janus Films, Inc. v. City of Fort Worth*, 358 S.W.2d 589 (1962). The supreme court has defined the status quo as "the last, actual peaceable, non-contested status that preceded the pending controversy." *Texas v. Southwestern Bell Tel. Co.* 526 S.W.2d 526, 528 (Tex. 1975). The status quo of accident report information prior to the enactment of S.B. 1069 is governed by section 47 of article 6701d of the Texas Civil Statutes.²

Section 47(b)(1) provides that:

The Department or a law enforcement agency employing a peace officer who made an accident report *is required to release a copy of the report* on request to:

....

(D) a person who provides the Department or the law enforcement agency with two or more of the following:

- (i) the date of the accident;
- (ii) the name of any person involved in the accident; or
- (iii) the specific location of the accident

²Although the Seventy fourth Legislature repealed and codified article 6701d as part of the Transportation Code, the legislature did not intend a substantive change of the law but merely a recodification of existing law. Act of May 1, 1995, 74th Leg., R.S., ch. 165, §§ 24, 25 1995 Tex. Gen. Laws 1025, 1870-71. Furthermore, the Seventy-fourth Legislature, without reference to the repeal and codification of V.T.C.S. article 6701d, amended section 47 of article 6701d, V.T.C.S., relating to the disclosure of accident reports. Act of May 27, 1995, 74th Leg., R.S., ch. 894, § 1, 1995 Tex. Gen. Laws 4413, 4414. Because the repeal of a statute by a code does not affect an amendment of the statute by the same legislature which enacted the code, the amendment is preserved and given effect as part of the code provision. Gov't Code § 311.031(c). Thus, the amendment of section 47 of article 6701d, V.T.C.S. is the existing law regarding the availability of accident report information, and may be found following section 550.065 of the Transportation Code. *See also* Act of May 27, 1995, 74th Leg., R.S., ch. 894, § 1, 1995 Tex. Gen. Laws 4413, 4414.

V.T.C.S. art. 6701d, § 47(b)(1) (emphasis added). Under this provision, a law enforcement agency “is required to release” a copy of an accident report to a person who provides the law enforcement agency with two or more pieces of information specified by the statute. *Id.* In the situation at hand, the requestor has not provided the city with the requisite two pieces of information. Thus, you are not required to release this information under section 47(b)(1)(D) of article 6701d of the Texas Civil Statutes.

Next, you argue that section 552.103 excepts from public disclosure all of the requested information. Section 552.103(a), the “litigation exception,” excepts from disclosure information relating to litigation to which the state is or may be a party. 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, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (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). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 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). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986).

We have reviewed your arguments and the submitted information, and we conclude that you have shown that litigation is reasonably anticipated for purposes of section 552.103(a). We also agree that the requested information relates to the anticipated litigation. Thus, you may withhold most of the requested information based on section 552.103(a). However, the

³In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: 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 threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

submitted resolution adopted by the city may not be withheld under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. Open Records Decision Nos. 551 at 2-3 (1990) (laws or ordinances are open records), 221 at 1 (1979) (“official records of the public proceedings of a governmental body are among the most open of records”).

We note that if the opposing party in the litigation has seen or had access to any of the information in these records, there is no section 552.103(a) interest in withholding that information from the requestor. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). In addition, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation concludes. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

We are resolving this matter with an informal letter ruling rather than with a published open records decision. This ruling is limited to the particular records at issue under the facts presented to us in this request and should not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records. If you have questions about this ruling, please contact our office.

Sincerely,



Yen-Ha Le
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

YHL/nc

Ref.: ID# 127201

Encl.: Submitted documents

cc: Mr. M. Ronald Eckert, P.C.
P.O. Box 4005
Midland, Texas 79704
(w/o enclosures)