



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 18, 2005

Mr. Robert R. Ray
Assistant City Attorney
City of Longview
P.O. Box 1952
Longview, Texas 75606

OR2005-09458

Dear Mr. Ray:

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# 234552.

The City of Longview (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a particular incident. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.111, 552.117, 552.130, 552.137, and 552.147 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Portions of the submitted information are subject to required public disclosure under section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in relevant 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[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Upon review, we find that, with the exception of the Texas Association of Counties letter and the email dated July 28, 2005, the remaining submitted information constitutes a completed investigation. Pursuant to section 552.022, the city must release this information unless it is confidential under other law.

We note that the documents you seek to withhold include an accident report form that appears to have been completed pursuant to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. See Transp. Code § 550.064 (Texas Peace Officer's Accident Report form). Section 550.065(b)

of the Transportation Code states that 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 two of the following three pieces of information: (1) date of the accident; (2) name of any person involved in the accident; and (3) specific location of the accident. Transp. Code § 550.065(c)(4). Under this provision, the Department of Public Safety or another governmental body is required to release a copy of an accident report to a person who provides the governmental body with two or more pieces of information specified by the statute. *Id.* In the present request, the requestor has provided the date and name of a person involved in the accident described in the report. Thus, the department must release the entire accident report we have marked under section 550.065(c).¹

Sections 552.103 and 552.111 are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; *Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (section 552.103 may be waived); Open Records Decision No. 473 (1987) (section 552.111 may be waived). As such, sections 552.103 and 552.111 are not "other law" that make information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held that the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022 of the Government Code. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). The attorney work product privilege is also found at rule 192.5 of the Texas Rules of Civil Procedure. Accordingly, we consider whether the city may withhold these portions of the submitted information pursuant to rule 192.5.

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 when the governmental body received the request for information 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

¹Section 550.065 governs the release of the ST-3 accident report. Therefore, the city may not withhold the information under sections 552.117 and 552.130.

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 completed investigation constitutes attorney work product. You state that the documents were prepared in anticipation of possible litigation. However, the city has not explained whether the documents contain the mental impressions, opinions, conclusions, or legal theories of an attorney or an attorney's representative. Therefore, we conclude that the city may not withhold any of the information under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision," and encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy 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. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. 540 S.W.2d at 683.

This office also has recognized that public employees may have a privacy interest in their drug test results. See Open Records Decision Nos. 594 (1991) (suggesting identification of individual as having tested positive for use of illegal drug may raise privacy issues), 455 at 5 (1987) (citing *Shoemaker v. Handel*, 619 F. Supp. 1089 (D.N.J. 1985), *aff'd*, 795 F.2d 1136 (3rd Cir. 1986)). Generally, however, the public has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. See Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 542 at 5 (1990) (information in public employee's resume not protected by constitutional or common-law privacy under statutory predecessors to Gov't Code §§ 552.101 and 552.102). Information that pertains to an employee's actions as a public servant generally cannot be considered to be beyond the realm of legitimate public interest. See Open Records Decision Nos. 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public

employees), 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). You inform us that the police officer's drug test was administered after the accident and was ordered as a result of the accident. Therefore, the drug test results are directly related to the officer's employment. Having considered your arguments and reviewed the information that you claim is private, we conclude that there is a legitimate public interest in the information and the city may not withhold this information on privacy grounds under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who timely elect to keep this information confidential pursuant to section 552.024. We note, however, that the protection of section 552.117 only applies to information that the governmental body holds in its capacity as an employer. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117 (providing that employees of governmental entities may protect certain personal information in the hands of their employer); *see also* Gov't Code § 552.024 (establishing election process for Gov't Code § 552.117). In this instance, the requestor's client is not the city's employee. Consequently, we find that the city may not withhold his personal information under section 552.117.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information that "relates to . . . a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state [or] a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state." Gov't Code § 552.130. In accordance with section 552.130 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information we have marked in the submitted documents.

Section 552.137 makes certain e-mail addresses confidential. Section 552.137 provides:

(a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under this chapter.

(b) Confidential information described by this section that relates to a member of the public may be disclosed if the member of the public affirmatively consents to its release.

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply to an e-mail address:

(1) provided to a governmental body by a person who has a contractual relationship with the governmental body or by the contractor's agent;

(2) provided to a governmental body by a vendor who seeks to contract with the governmental body or by the vendor's agent;

(3) contained in a response to a request for bids or proposals, contained in a response to similar invitations soliciting offers or information relating to a potential contract, or provided to a governmental body in the course of negotiating the terms of a contract or potential contract; or

(4) provided to a governmental body on a letterhead, coversheet, printed document, or other document made available to the public.

(d) Subsection (a) does not prevent a governmental body from disclosing an e-mail address for any reason to another governmental body or to a federal agency.

Gov't Code § 552.137. Under section 552.137, a governmental body must withhold the e-mail address of a member of the general public, unless the individual to whom the e-mail address belongs has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. *See id.* § 552.137(b). You do not inform us that a member of the public has affirmatively consented to the release of any e-mail address contained in the submitted materials. The city must, therefore, withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137.

Section 552.147 of the Government Code² provides that “[t]he social security number of a living person is excepted from” required public disclosure under the Act.³ Therefore, the city must withhold the social security number we have marked under section 552.147.

In summary, you must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to sections 552.130, 552.137, and 552.147 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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

²Added 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).

³We 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.

governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by 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,



Jaime L. Flores
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLF/jpa

Mr. Robert R. Ray - Page 7

Ref: ID# 234552

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Charles P. Connolly
Connolly & Hughes, L.L.P.
Austin Bank Building #402
3400 W. Marshall Avenue
Longview, Texas 75604
(w/o enclosures)