



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 12, 2005

Ms. Cynthia Villarreal-Reyna
Section Chief
Legal and Compliance Division
Texas Department of Insurance
P.O. Box 149104
Austin, Texas 78714-9104

OR2005-09254

Dear Ms. Villarreal-Reyna:

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# 233243.

The Texas Department of Insurance (the "department") received a request for five categories of information relating to a named agent. You state that you will release some of the responsive information to the requestor. You state that the department has no documents responsive to category five of the request.¹ However, you claim that some of the responsive information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.111, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹Chapter 552 of the Government Code does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information. *See Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App. – San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

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

First, you indicate that the department intends to withhold certain information pursuant to the previous determination of this office in Open Records Letter No. 2005-05223 (2005). In that decision, we determined that information acquired by the department relevant to an inquiry by the Insurance Fraud Unit and deemed confidential by the commissioner is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 701.151 of the Insurance Code. We therefore agree the department must withhold the information obtained during the course of the Fraud Unit's investigations that are deemed confidential by the commissioner pursuant to the previous determination in Open Records Letter No. 2005-05223. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001).

Next, we note that a portion of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in part:

the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

- (1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108;

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). A portion of the submitted information constitutes a completed report made of, for, or by the department that must be released pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1), unless it is excepted from disclosure under "other law". Section 552.111 of the Government Code is a discretionary exception that may be waived and, as such, do not constitute "other law" that makes information confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a)(1). *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 10 (2002) (attorney work product privilege under section 552.111 may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver). Therefore, none of the information at issue may be withheld under section 552.111. However, the department also contends that the information at issue is protected by the attorney work product privilege under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. The Texas Supreme Court has held that the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are "other law" for purposes of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will address your arguments under rule 192.5 for the completed report. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001).

For the purpose of section 552.022, information is confidential under rule 192.5 only to the extent the information implicates the core work product aspect of the work product privilege. Open Records Decision No. 677 at 9-10 (2002). Core work product is defined as the work product of an attorney or an attorney's representative developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial that contains the attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(a), (b)(1). Accordingly, in

order to withhold attorney core work product from disclosure under rule 192.5, a governmental body must demonstrate that the material was 1) created for trial or in anticipation of litigation and 2) consists of an attorney's or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. *Id.*

The first prong of the work product test, which requires a governmental body to show that the information at issue was created in anticipation of litigation, has two parts. A governmental body must demonstrate that 1) 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 2) the party resisting discovery believed in good faith that there was a substantial chance that litigation would ensue and conducted the investigation for the purpose of preparing for such litigation. *See Nat'l Tank 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. The second prong of the work product test requires the governmental body to show that the documents at issue contain the attorney's, or the attorney's representative's mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories. TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both prongs of the work product test is confidential under rule 192.5 provided the information does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 192.5(c). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ). You contend that the section 552.022 information constitutes attorney work product. You indicate that this document was prepared by the department's attorneys or their representatives in anticipation of litigation, and that this document contains the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of the attorney or attorney's representative. Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we conclude that the department may withhold the section 552.022 information we have marked under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

We now address your arguments for the remaining information that is not subject to section 552.022. Section 552.111 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. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993)*. The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, no writ); *Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990)*. In *Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993)*, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined that section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5.*

A governmental body's policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. The Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body's policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body's policy mission. *See Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995).*

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5.* However, if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).*

This office has also concluded that a preliminary draft of a document that is intended for public release in its final form necessarily represents the drafter's advice, opinion, and recommendation with regard to the form and content of the final document, so as to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.111. *See Open Records Decision No. 559 at 2 (1990)* (applying statutory predecessor). Section 552.111 protects factual information in the draft that also will be included in the final version of the document. *See id.* at 2-3. Thus, section 552.111 encompasses the entire contents, including comments, underlining, deletions, and proofreading marks, of a preliminary draft of a policymaking document that will be released to the public in its final form. *See id.* at 2.

You state that the information at issue under section 552.111 consists of communications that address the handling of regulatory matters, recommended actions, and opinions and analyses of regulatory matters, as well as opinions as to violations of law and compliance with legal requirements. We understand you to assert that the initiation and resolution of a regulatory matter is a matter of policy. Upon review, we conclude that the department may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111.

Section 552.101 excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976).

This office has found that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are excepted from disclosure under common-law privacy.

See Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). Personal financial information is generally excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (personal financial choices concerning insurance are generally confidential), 545 (1990) (common-law privacy protects personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (common-law privacy protects assets and income source information). We note, however, that common-law privacy protects the privacy interests of individuals, but not of corporations or other types of business organizations. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); *see also U. S. v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950); *Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989), *rev'd on other grounds*, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990) (corporation has no right to privacy). However, the financial information of a company that is an individual or sole proprietorship is confidential under common-law privacy. *See Morton*, 338 U.S. at 652; ORD 620. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information that we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

You also claim that a portion of the submitted information is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136 provides as follows:

(a) In this section, “access device” means a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to:

- (1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value; or
- (2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.

Gov't Code § 552.136. You raise section 552.136 for bank account and insurance policy numbers. We agree that this information that you have marked, in addition to the information we have marked, must be withheld under section 552.136.

Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c)). Section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee’s work e-mail address because such an address is not that of the employee as a “member of the public” but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. The e-mail addresses at issue does not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Thus, the department must withhold the e-mail address you have marked, in addition to the e-mail address we have marked, under section 552.137 unless its owner has affirmatively consented to its release. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(b).

Finally, we note that the submitted information contains social security numbers. Section 552.147 of the Government Code³ provides that “[t]he social security number of a living person is excepted from” required public disclosure under the Act. Therefore, the department must withhold the social security numbers contained in the submitted information under section 552.147.⁴

In summary, the department may withhold the section 552.022 information we have marked under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5. The department may withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.111. The department must withhold the information that we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The marked policy and bank account numbers must be withheld under section 552.136. Unless the department has received affirmative consent to release the marked e-mail address, you must withhold it pursuant to section 552.137. The department must withhold the social security numbers contained in the submitted information under section 552.147. The remaining information must be released.

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

³Added by Act of May 23, 2005, 79th Leg., R.S., S.B. 1485, § 1, sec. 552.147(a) (to be codified at Tex. Gov’t Code § 552.147).

⁴We note that section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person’s social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act.

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,



James Forrest
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JF/seg

Ref: ID# 233243

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Samuel E. Whitley
Whitley Law Group, P.C.
1001 South Dairy Ashford, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77077
(w/o enclosures)