



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 5, 2012

Ms. Cynthia Villarreal-Reyna
Director
Office of Agency Counsel, Legal Section
General Counsel Division, MC 110-1A
Texas Department of Insurance
P.O. Box 149104
Austin, Texas 78714-9104

OR2012-04970

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# 450303 (TDI # 123894).

The Texas Department of Insurance (the "department") received two requests from the same requestor for complaints, derogatory statements, misconduct, and disciplinary actions regarding two named individuals. You state that you will release some of the information to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is privileged under rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. We have considered your argument and reviewed the submitted information.

You inform us the submitted information is from a closed investigative enforcement case file. Thus, you acknowledge the information is subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. This section provides for the required public disclosure of "a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body," unless the information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The Texas Supreme Court has held that the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022. *In re City of Georgetown*, S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Therefore, we will consider your argument under rule 192.5 for the submitted information.

Rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure encompasses the attorney work product privilege. For purposes of section 552.022 of the Government Code, information is confidential under rule 192.5 only to the extent the information implicates the core work product aspect of the work product privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 677 at 9-10 (2002). Rule 192.5 defines core work product as the work product of an attorney or an attorney's representative, developed in anticipation of litigation or for trial, that contains the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of the attorney or the attorney's representative. *See* 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 the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative. *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 part of the work product test requires the governmental body to show that the materials at issue contain the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney's or an attorney's representative. *See* TEX. R. CIV. P. 192.5(b)(1). A document containing core work product information that meets both parts of the work product test is confidential under rule 192.5, provided that the information does not fall within the scope of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 192.5(c). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

You state the submitted Requests for Disposition were prepared by department attorneys in preparation for potential administrative action against the insurance companies and reveal their mental processes, conclusions, and legal theories. You contend the information reveals whether the attorney considered specific information to be significant, the attorney's thoughts regarding the information communicated to or uncovered by the attorney, and actions to be taken. Based on your representations and our review, we agree the submitted information is protected core work product. Accordingly, the department may withhold the submitted information under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

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, 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,



Kristi L. Wilkins
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KLW/sdk

Ref: ID# 450303

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)