



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

February 26, 2013

Mr. James A. McKechnie  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Wichita Falls  
P.O. Box 1431  
Wichita Falls, Texas 76307-1431

OR2013-03210

Dear Mr. McKechnie:

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# 479978 (City ID No. 589).

The City of Wichita Falls (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified accident involving the requestor's client. You claim the submitted 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.

Initially, we note the submitted information contains a CR-3 crash report form 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), accident reports are privileged and confidential. Section 550.065(c)(4) provides for the release of accident reports to a person who provides at least 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).

In this instance, the requestor has provided the city with the requisite pieces of information. Although you seek to withhold this information under section 552.103 of the Government Code, a statute governing the release of specific information prevails 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). Accordingly, the city must release the submitted CR-3 accident report form to the requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c)(4) of the Transportation Code.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(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 governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show 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 the department received the request for information, 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 governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). ORD 551 at 4.

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. See Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To demonstrate litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *Id.* 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. 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 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).

This office has also concluded a governmental body's receipt of a claim letter that it represents to be in compliance with the notice requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act ("TTCA"), chapter 101 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code, or an applicable municipal ordinance, is sufficient to establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 638 at 4 (1996). If that representation is not made, the receipt of a claim letter is a factor we will consider in determining, from the totality of the circumstances presented, whether the governmental body has established that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *Id.*

The city states it received a notice of claim letter from an attorney representing an individual allegedly injured in the specified accident. The city has submitted the notice of claim letter for our review. The city argues the submitted notice of claim complies with the notice requirements in chapter 101 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code. However, we note the submitted notice of claim letter was not received until December 10, 2012, five days after the city received the instant request for information, and, thus, does not demonstrate the city anticipated litigation on the date the request for information was received. In addition, while the submitted information shows the requestor is an attorney who was retained by the individual prior to date of the request, as stated above, 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. ORD 361. Accordingly, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the city reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the instant request for information. Therefore, the city may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. As you raise no other exceptions to disclosure, the submitted information must be released.

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,



Michelle R. Garza  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division  
MRG/bhf

Ref: ID# 479978

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

