



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 1, 2017

Mr. Andrew Wipke  
Assistant District Attorney  
County of Lubbock  
P.O. Box 10536  
Lubbock, Texas 79408-3536

OR2017-11986

Dear Mr. Wipke:

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# 660061 (ORR 234).

The Lubbock County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office") received a request for information pertaining to a specified motor vehicle accident. The sheriff's office claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.130, and 552.147 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions the sheriff's office claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note a portion of the submitted information is subject to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. Section 550.065 applies only to a written report of an accident required under section 550.061, 550.062, or 601.004. Transp. Code § 550.065(a)(1). Chapter 550 requires the creation of a written report when the accident resulted in injury to or the death of a person or damage to the property of any person to the apparent extent of \$1,000 or more. *Id.* §§ 550.061 (operator's accident report), .062 (officer's accident report). An accident report is privileged and for the confidential use of the Texas Department of Transportation or a local governmental agency of Texas that has use for the

information for accident prevention purposes. *Id.* § 550.065(b). However, a governmental entity shall release an accident report in accordance with subsections (c) and (c-1). *Id.* § 550.065(c), (c-1). Section 550.065(c) provides a governmental entity shall release an accident report to a person or entity listed under this subsection. *Id.* § 550.065(c).

Here, the requestor is a person listed under section 550.065(c). Although the sheriff's office asserts section 552.103 to withhold the submitted information, a statutory right of access prevails over the Act's general exceptions to public disclosure. *See e.g.*, 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 exception to disclosure under the Act). Because section 552.103 is a general exception under the Act, the requestor's statutory access under section 550.065(c) prevails and the sheriff's office may not withhold the information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Additionally, although the sheriff's office also raises section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy, we note a specific statutory right of access overcomes the common law. *See Collins v. Tex Mall, L.P.*, 297 S.W.3d 409, 415 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2009, no pet.) (statutory provision controls and preempts common law only when statute directly conflicts with common-law principle).

The sheriff's office also asserts portions of the CR-3 accident report are confidential under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 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 exceptions to public disclosure under the Act. *See Attorney General Opinion DM-146* at 3 (1992); *see also* ORD Nos. 613 at 4, 451. 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(c) 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. As mentioned above, section 550.065(c) specifically provides access only to accident reports of the type at issue, while section 552.130 generally excepts motor vehicle record information maintained in any context. Thus, we conclude the access to an accident report provided under section 550.065(c) is more specific than the general confidentiality provided under section 552.130. Therefore, the sheriff's office may not withhold any portion of the CR-3 accident report under section 552.130. Accordingly, the sheriff's office must release the CR-3 accident report in its entirety pursuant to section 550.065(c).

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in relevant part 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). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show section 552.103(a) is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *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 section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551.

To establish 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." *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, or when an individual threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 346 (1982), 288 (1981). In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated a governmental body has met its burden of showing litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter and the governmental body represents the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act ("TTCA"), Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code, ch. 101. 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 litigation is reasonably anticipated based on the totality of the circumstances. 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 a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

The sheriff's office states, and provides documentation showing, concurrent with the sheriff's office's receipt of the instant request for information, the sheriff's office received a notice of claim from the requestor, an attorney, representing two individuals in a personal injury claim against the sheriff's office. The sheriff's office does not affirmatively represent to this office the notice of claim meets the requirements of the TTCA; therefore, we will only consider the notice of claim as a factor in determining whether the sheriff's office reasonably anticipated litigation over the incident in question. Nevertheless, based upon the sheriff's office's representation, our review of the information at issue, and the totality of the circumstances, we find the sheriff's office reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the instant request. We further find the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103. Therefore, the sheriff's office may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup>

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to all parties to the pending or anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has concluded. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, the sheriff's office must release the CR-3 accident report pursuant to section 550.065(c) of the Transportation Code. The sheriff's office may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 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.

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the sheriff's office's remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Rahat Huq  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RSH/som

Ref: ID# 660061

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)