



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 12, 2007

Ms. Sara Shiplet Waitt
Senior Associate Commissioner
Legal Services Division
Texas Department of Insurance
P. O. Box 149104
Austin, Texas 78714

OR2007-14792

Dear Ms. Waitt:

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 #294437.

The Texas Department of Insurance (the "department") received a request for a specified health insurance complaint. You state that a portion of the requested information will be released to the requestor. You also state that you will withhold certain enrollee information pursuant to a previous determination issued by this office. *See* Open Records Letter No. 2001-4777 (2001) (concluding that department could withhold the name, address, telephone number, birth date, social security number, and claim number of enrollees without requesting a ruling from this office); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 673 at 7-8 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a)). You claim that the remaining submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.111, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code. You also believe that the requested information may contain the proprietary information of a third party, United HealthCare ("United"). Although you take no position on the proprietary nature of the information at issue, you have notified United of the request and of its right to submit comments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain the applicability of exception to disclose under the Act in

certain circumstances). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this decision, United has not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that it has protected proprietary interests in any of the submitted information. *See, e.g., id.* § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). Accordingly, we conclude that the department may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest United may have in the information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from required public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. You claim that a portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with the Medical Practice Act (the "MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in part:

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002 (b), (c). Information that is subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See* Occ. Code §§ 159.002, .004; Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). The information you assert is subject to the MPA consists of a health insurance collection letter, as well as health insurance claim forms. Upon review, we find that the health insurance claim forms were created by a physician that pertain to the diagnosis, treatment, or evaluation of a patient. Thus, these forms, which we have marked, constitute medical records for purposes of the MPA, and they must be withheld

under section 552.101 on this basis. However, the collection letter pertains to attempts by a hospital to collect payment from United and was signed by a hospital employee in the “Collections” department, rather than by a physician. Accordingly, we find that this letter may not be withheld under the MPA as a medical record.

Section 552.101 also 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). This office has found that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are excepted from required public 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). In this instance, you have already redacted the identifying information of the individual to whom the potentially private information relates. Accordingly, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under common law privacy.

Next, we address your arguments under section 552.111 of the Government Code, which excepts from public disclosure “an interagency or intra-agency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” Gov’t Code § 552.111. Section 552.111 encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of this exception 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, 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, and opinions that reflect the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 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). Furthermore, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *See* ORD 615 at 5. But, 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).

You state that the information you marked under section 552.111 consists of communications exchanged between department employees. You also state that these communications “address the handling of regulatory matters, recommended actions, and opinions and analyses of regulatory matters.” You inform us that the information you marked constitutes “opinions as to violations of law and compliance with legal requirements, as well as investigation and enforcement strategy.” After reviewing your arguments and the information at issue, we find that the department may withhold the information it marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

The department also asserts that the marked insurance policy numbers are excepted from disclosure under section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136 provides that “[n]otwithstanding 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. Accordingly, the department must withhold the insurance policy numbers it has marked, as well as the policy numbers we have marked, in the submitted information pursuant to section 552.136.

Next, the department claims that section 552.137 of the Government Code applies to the marked e-mail address. 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 id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address contained in the submitted information is not of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Accordingly, the department must withhold the e-mail address you have marked pursuant to section 552.137.

You also assert that the submitted documents contain information that appears to be protected by copyright. A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception to disclosure applies to the information. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). An officer for public information also must comply with the copyright law, however, and is not required to furnish copies of copyrighted information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, he or she must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 at 8-9 (1990).

In summary, the department may continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2001-4777 with regards to confidential enrollee information. The department must withhold the information marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the

MPA, as well as information marked under sections 552.136 and 552.137 of the Government Code. The department may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor in accordance with copyright law.

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 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Reg Hargrove". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Reg Hargrove
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RJH/eeg

Ref: ID# 294437

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Robert Carranza
2613 South 3rd Street
Austin, Texas 78704
(w/o enclosures)