



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 27, 2006

Ms. Veronica Ocanas
Assistant City Attorney
City of Corpus Christi
P.O. Box 9277
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469-9277

OR2006-02968

Dear Ms. Ocanas:

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# 244915.

The City of Corpus Christi (the "city") received a request for "all employee records, past and present" of a named city employee, and all records pertaining to a traffic accident that occurred on November 1, 2004 involving the named city employee. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that you have only submitted records pertaining to the traffic accident that occurred on November 1, 2004. To the extent any other information responsive to the request existed on the date the city received this request, we assume you have released it. If you have not released any such information, you must do so at this time. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; see also Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body

¹Although you initially raised sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code as exceptions to disclosure, you did not submit to this office written comments stating the reasons why these sections would allow the information to be withheld; we therefore assume you no longer assert these exceptions. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Next, we note the submitted information includes an ST-3 accident report form completed pursuant to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. *See* Transp. Code § 550.064 (Texas Peace Officer's Accident Report form). Section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code 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. Transp. Code § 550.065(c)(4). In this case, the requestor has provided two pieces of information specified by the statute. Although you contend that this information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code, the exceptions found in the Act generally do not apply to information that is made public by other statutes. *See* Open Records Decision No. 525 (1989) (statutory predecessor). Accordingly, the city must release an unredacted copy of the ST-3 accident report, which we have marked, to the requestor. We will next address your arguments for the remaining submitted information.

Section 552.103 of the Governmental Code 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.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The city 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 on the date the governmental body received the request, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *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 n.r.e.); Open Records

Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The city 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). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated that a governmental body has met its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter and the governmental body represents that the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act ("TTCA"), chapter 101 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code, or an applicable municipal ordinance. If a governmental body does not make this representation, the claim letter is a factor that this office will consider in determining whether a governmental body has established that litigation is reasonably anticipated based on the totality of the circumstances.

You inform us that the city received a notice of claim letter, prior to the date the city received this request for information, from an attorney who represents the requestor. We note, however, that you have not represented that this notice of claim letter meets the requirements of the TTCA. Therefore, we will only consider the claim letter as a factor in determining whether the city reasonably anticipated litigation over the incident in question. Based on your representations and our review of the notice of claim letter and the remaining submitted information, we agree that litigation was pending on the date the request was received. We also find that the information at issue is related to the litigation. Thus, section 552.103 is applicable to the remaining submitted information.

We note, however, that the opposing party in the anticipated litigation may already have seen or had access to some of the remaining submitted information. The purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information that relates to the litigation through discovery procedures. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4-5 (1990). If the opposing party has seen or had access to information that relates to anticipated litigation, through discovery or otherwise, then there is no interest in withholding the information from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, to the extent that the opposing party in the anticipated litigation has seen or had access to any of the remaining submitted information, the city may not withhold any such information under section 552.103. With the exception of any such information, the remaining submitted information is excepted from disclosure at this time. We note that the applicability of this exception under section 552.103 ends when the related litigation concludes or is no longer reasonably anticipated. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

With respect to the remaining submitted information that is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103, you also raise section 552.111 of the Government Code. This section 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. You assert the attorney work product privilege under this exception. Section 552.111 encompasses the attorney work product privilege found in rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. See *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). A governmental body that seeks to withhold information under rule 192.5 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.*; Open Records Decision No. 677 at 6-8 (2002). 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; Open Records Decision No. 677 at 7. Upon review of your arguments, we conclude you have not demonstrated that the remaining information constitutes communications, materials prepared, or mental impressions developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial between the city and the city’s representatives or among the city’s representatives. We therefore conclude that the

remaining submitted information does not constitute attorney work product under section 552.111 of the Government Code, and none of it may not be withheld on this basis.

In summary, the city must release the ST-3 accident report, which we have marked, to the requestor. Except for any information that the opposing party in the anticipated litigation has seen or to which she has had access, the city may withhold the rest of the submitted information at this time under section 552.103.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Dep't of Pub. 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Lisa V. Cubriel
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LVC/jh

Ref: ID# 244915

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Ashley Korth
304 Station Street
Port Aransas, Texas 78373
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kenneth A. Korth, P.C.
Korth, Heller & Garcia
P.O. Box 2177
Victoria, Texas 77902
(w/o enclosures)