



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 3, 2020

Mr. Jeffrey C. Monk
HPD Administration Manager
City of Houston
1200 Travis, 10th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002-6000

OR2020-22242

Dear Mr. Monk:

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# 843176 (ORU No. 20-06199).

The Houston Police Department (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to a specified investigation. You state the department will release some information to the requestor. You also state the department does not maintain information responsive to a portion of the request.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information, a portion of which is a representative sample.²

Initially, we note the submitted information contains a copy of a CR-3 crash report form completed pursuant to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101.

¹ The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

² We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Section 552.101 encompasses information subject to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. Section 550.065 applies only to a written report of a crash 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 crash 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). A crash 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 a crash report in accordance with subsection (c). *Id.* § 550.065(c). Section 550.065(c) provides a governmental entity shall release a crash report to a person or entity listed under this subsection. *Id.* § 550.065(c). Here, the requestor represents a person involved in the crash. *See id.* § 550.065(c)(4)(B). Although you assert section 552.103 to withhold this 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 department may not withhold the CR-3 crash report form under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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 that (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 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”), Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code, ch. 101. 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 litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

The department states, prior to the date it received the instant request for information, the department received a notice of claim from the requestor, an attorney whose client was involved in a motor vehicle accident with a department employee. The department affirmatively states the notice of claim meets the requirements of the TTCA. Thus, we find the department reasonably anticipated litigation related to the matter at issue. The department further states the information at issue is related to the anticipated litigation. Based on these representations and our review, we find the information at issue is related to litigation that was reasonably anticipated on the date the department received the request for information. Therefore, except for the submitted CR-3 crash report, the department may withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.³

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 been concluded. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information. Further, as we are able to make this determination, we do not address the applicability of section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code to the submitted video recording. *See generally* Occ. Code § 1701.661(a), (e).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 143.1214 of the Local Government Code, which provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(b) The department shall maintain an investigatory file that relates to a disciplinary action against a fire fighter or police officer that was overturned on appeal, or any document in the possession of the department that relates to a charge of misconduct against a fire fighter or police officer, regardless of whether the charge is sustained, only in a file created by the department for the department's use. The department may only release information in those investigatory files or documents relating to a charge of misconduct:

- (1) to another law enforcement agency or fire department;
- (2) to the office of a district or United States attorney; or
- (3) in accordance with Subsection (c).

(c) The department head or the department head's designee may forward a document that relates to disciplinary action against a fire fighter or police officer to the director or the director's designee for inclusion in the fire fighter's or police officer's personnel file maintained under Sections 143.089(a)-(f) only if:

- (1) disciplinary action was actually taken against the fire fighter or police officer;
- (2) the document shows the disciplinary action taken; and
- (3) the document includes at least a brief summary of the facts on which the disciplinary action was based.

Local Gov't Code § 143.1214(b)-(c). The department states the City of Houston is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. The department further states the remaining information is maintained in the department's internal investigative files and relates to an open investigation by the department's Internal Affairs Division of alleged misconduct by a police officer. Additionally, the department states the requestor is not a representative from another law enforcement agency, a fire department, or the office of a district or United States attorney. *See id.* § 143.1214(b)(1)-(2). However, we find the remaining information consists of the CR-3 accident report from the specified accident, which is maintained independently from the police officer's internal file. In this instance, the requestor has specifically requested this information, which is maintained for law enforcement purposes separate and apart from any internal files. The department may not engraft the confidentiality afforded to records under section 143.1214 to records that exist independently of the internal files. Accordingly, the CR-3 accident report is not confidential under section 143.1214 of the Local Government Code, and the department may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

In summary, except for the submitted CR-3 crash report, which must be released, the department may withhold the submitted 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.

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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Katie Stallcup
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AKS/jm

Ref: ID# 843176

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)