



February 26, 2002

Ms. Tina Plummer  
Open Records Coordinator  
Texas Department of Mental Health Mental Retardation  
P.O. Box 12668  
Austin, Texas 78711-2668

OR2002-0914

Dear Ms. Plummer:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 159083.

The Texas Department of Mental Health Mental Retardation (the “department”) received a request for “public records relative to the deaths of all patients and students that occurred at the San Antonio State Hospital . . . from the time periods of 1996 through and including 2001.” The requestor subsequently narrowed his request to exclude patient-identifying information, and to include only those documents related to patient restraint. You claim that the requested 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.

We first note that you have marked patient-identifying information, which is nonresponsive to the request, in pink highlighter. We do not address the required public disclosure of the nonresponsive information in this ruling

You claim that section 552.103 of the Government Code will except the submitted information from public disclosure. Section 552.103 provides 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.

The department 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, 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 department 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.<sup>1</sup> 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). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You inform us that the requestor is an investigator for a prominent law firm. You state that the requestor mentioned a patient at the San Antonio State Hospital who had been restrained,

---

<sup>1</sup>In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, see Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); 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).

and who subsequently died. You do not, however, provide any concrete evidence to support your claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated. We thus find that litigation is not reasonably anticipated in this case. Therefore, the responsive information may not be withheld under section 552.103(a).

Although you have not raised section 552.101 of the Government Code as an applicable exception, we must consider whether any of the information requested is excepted from required public disclosure pursuant to section 552.101. The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.101 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987). Section 552.101 excepts from required public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Thus, section 552.101 protects information that is made confidential by statute. Subchapter D of chapter 161 of the Health and Safety Code governs medical committees and medical peer review committees. Section 161.031 defines a “medical committee” as including “any committee, including a joint committee, of . . . a hospital [or] medical organization” and further provides that “[t]he term includes a committee appointed ad hoc to conduct a specific investigation or established under state or federal law or rule or under the bylaws or rules of the organization or institution.” Health & Safety Code § 161.031(a)(1)-(2), (b). Section 161.0315 provides in relevant part that “[t]he governing body of a hospital [or] medical organization . . . may form . . . a medical committee, as defined by section 161.031, to evaluate medical and health care services[.]” Health & Safety Code § 161.0315(a). Section 161.032 provides in relevant part:

(a) The records and proceedings of a medical committee are confidential and are not subject to court subpoena. . . . Records, information, or reports of a medical committee . . . and records, information, or reports provided by a medical committee . . . to the governing body of a public hospital . . . are not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code.

...

(c) This section . . . do[es] not apply to records made or maintained in the regular course of business by a hospital[.]

Health & Safety Code § 161.032(a), (c). A portion of the submitted information consists of accreditation reports prepared by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations. In *Humana Hospital Corporation v. Spears-Petersen*, the court found that the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations is a medical committee under section 161.031(a)(2), and its accreditation report of a hospital is confidential under section 161.032. *Humana Hospital Corp. v. Spears-Petersen*, 867 S.W.2d 858 (Tex. App.–San Antonio 1993, no pet.). Based on our review of the submitted documents, we conclude that the information that we have marked comprises records, information, or

reports of a medical committee acting under subchapter D of chapter 161 of the Health and Safety Code. We therefore conclude that this information is confidential under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 161.032(a) of the Health and Safety Code. Accordingly, the department must withhold the marked documents from public disclosure. *See also Barnes v. Whittington*, 751 S.W.2d 493, 495-96 (Tex. 1988) (construing predecessor statute); *Jordan v. Court of Appeals for the Fourth Judicial Dist.*, 701 S.W.2d 644, 646-48 (Tex. 1985) (same); *Texarkana Mem'l Hosp., Inc. v. Jones*, 551 S.W.2d 33, 34-36 (Tex. 1977) (same); Open Records Decision No. 591 at 2-3 (1991) (addressing scope of Health & Safety Code §§ 161.031, 161.032).

In conclusion, the department must withhold the marked information under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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 appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal 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, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, 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 appeal that decision by suing the governmental

body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public 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 Texas Building and Procurement Commission 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. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. 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,



Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/seg

Ref: ID# 159083

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Skip Hajek  
Law Offices of Maloney & Maloney  
115 East Travis Street, Suite 2000  
San Antonio, Texas 78205  
(w/o enclosures)