



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 8, 2016

Ms. Melanie J. Rodney
Assistant County Attorney
Harris County Attorney's Office
2525 Holly Hall, Suite 190
Houston, Texas 77054

OR2016-03026

Dear Ms. Rodney:

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# 597512 (CAO File No. 15HSP0741).

The Harris County Hospital District d/b/a Harris Health System (the "system") received a request for all information related to a specified allegation during a specified time period, including information related to a specified incident.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of some of the submitted information may implicate the interests of EPIC Implementation Services ("EPIC"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation demonstrating, you notified EPIC of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments stating why its information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances).

¹You state the system sought and received clarification of the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information, some of which is a representative sample.²

Initially, we note you have redacted portions of the submitted information. You state you will withhold information under section 552.137 of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), information that is subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code pursuant to section 552.024 of the Government Code, and social security numbers under section 552.147 of the Government Code.³ You do not assert, nor does our review of the records indicate, you have been authorized to withhold the remaining information you have redacted without seeking a ruling from this office. *See Gov't Code* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). Therefore, information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether the information comes within the scope of an exception to disclosure. In this instance, we can discern the nature of the additional redacted information; thus, being deprived of this information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. In the future, however, the system should refrain from redacting any information that it is not authorized to withhold in seeking an open records ruling. Failure to do so may result in the presumption the redacted information is public. *See Gov't Code* § 552.302.

Next, we note 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) of the Government Code to submit its reasons, if any, as to why requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, this office has not received comments from EPIC explaining why its information should not be released to the requestor. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Thus, we have no basis to

²This letter ruling assumes that the submitted representative sample of information is truly representative of the requested information as a whole. This ruling does not reach, and therefore does not authorize, the withholding of any other requested information to the extent that the other information is substantially different than that submitted to this office. *See Gov't Code* §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D), .302; Open Records Decision Nos. 499 at 6 (1988), 497 at 4 (1988).

³Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.024 authorizes a governmental body to redact from public release a current or former employee's home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information excepted from disclosure under section 552.117(a)(1) without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act, if the employee timely elected to withhold such information. *See Gov't Code* §§ 552.024(a)-(c), .117(a)(1). 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. *Id.* § 552.147(b).

conclude the release of the information at issue would implicate EPIC's interests, and it may not be withheld on that basis.

Next, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). The submitted information contains court-filed documents subject to section 552.022(a)(17). Thus, the information at issue must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* You seek to withhold the information at issue under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code. However, these sections are discretionary exceptions and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the information at issue may not be withheld under these exceptions. The Texas Supreme Court has held, however, the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Accordingly, we will address your attorney-client privilege claim under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. You also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code for some of the court-filed documents, which protects information made confidential under law. Thus, we will address your argument under section 552.101 for this information. We will also address your claims under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, and 552.111 for the information not subject to section 552.022(a)(17).

Texas Rule of Evidence 503 enacts the attorney-client privilege. Rule 503(b)(1) provides as follows:

A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services to the client:

(A) between the client or the client's representative and the client's lawyer or the lawyer's representative;

(B) between the client's lawyer and the lawyer's representative;

(C) by the client, the client's representative, the client's lawyer, or the lawyer's representative to a lawyer representing another party in a pending action or that lawyer's representative, if the communications concern a matter of common interest in the pending action;

(D) between the client's representatives or between the client and the client's representative; or

(E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is "confidential" if it is not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication. *Id.* 503(a)(5).

When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. *See* ORD 676 at 6-7. Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must: (1) show the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; (2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and (3) show the communication is confidential by explaining it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *See Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, orig. proceeding).

The information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) you have marked under attorney-client privilege consists of attachments to e-mail communications between system attorneys and system staff in their capacity as clients that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to the system. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. However, if the attachments are removed from the e-mails and stand alone, they are responsive to the request for information. Therefore, if these non-privileged attachments, which we have marked, are maintained by the system separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mails to which they are attached, then the system may not withhold the attachments under Texas Rule of Evidence 503. If the attachments subject to section 552.022 we have marked do not exist separate and apart from the e-mails to which they are attached, the system may withhold them under rule 503.

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. Section 552.101 encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (“HIPAA”) for portions of the submitted information. At the direction of Congress, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (“HHS”) promulgated regulations setting privacy standards for medical records, which HHS issued as the Federal Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information. *See* HIPAA, 42 U.S.C. § 1320d-2 (Supp. IV 1998) (historical & statutory note); Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information, 45 C.F.R. Pts. 160, 164 (“Privacy Rule”); *see also* Attorney General Opinion JC-0508 at 2 (2002). These standards govern the releasability of protected health information by a covered entity. *See* 45 C.F.R. pts. 160, 164. Under these standards, a covered entity may not use or disclose protected health information, excepted as provided by parts 160 and 164 of the Code of Federal Regulations. *Id.* § 164.502(a).

This office has addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act. Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004). In that decision, we noted section 164.512 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations provides a covered entity may use or disclose protected health information to the extent such use or disclosure is required by law and the use or disclosure complies with and is limited to the relevant requirements of such law. *See* 45 C.F.R. § 164.512(a)(1). We further noted the Act “is a mandate in Texas law that compels Texas governmental bodies to disclose information to the public.” *See* ORD 681 at 8; *see also* Gov’t Code §§ 552.002, .003, .021. We therefore held the disclosures under the Act come within section 164.512(a). Consequently, the Privacy Rule does not make information confidential for the purpose of section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Abbott v Tex. Dep’t of Mental Health & Mental Retardation*, 212 S.W.3d 648 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.); ORD 681 at 9; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 478 (1987) (as general rule, statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential). Because the Privacy Rule does not make confidential information that is subject to disclosure under the Act, the system may not withhold any portion of the information at issue on that basis.

Section 552.101 also encompasses section 160.007 of the Occupations Code and section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code. Section 160.007 of the Occupations Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) Except as otherwise provided by this subtitle, each proceeding or record of a medical peer review committee is confidential, and any communication made to a medical peer review committee is privileged.

Occ. Code § 160.007(a). A medical peer review committee is “the governing board of a health care entity . . . that operates under written bylaws approved by the policy-making body or the governing board of the health care entity and is authorized to evaluate the quality of

medical and health care services[.]” *Id.* § 151.002(a)(8). Section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code addresses the broader category of medical committees and provides in relevant part:

(a) The records and proceedings of a medical committee are confidential and are not subject to court subpoena.

...

(c) Records, information, or reports of a medical committee, medical peer review committee, or compliance officer and records, information, or reports provided by a medical committee, medical peer review committee, or compliance officer to the governing body of a public hospital, hospital district, or hospital authority are not subject to disclosure under [the Act].

...

(f) This section and Subchapter A, Chapter 160, Occupations Code, do not apply to records made or maintained in the regular course of business by a hospital, health maintenance organization, medical organization, university medical center or health science center, hospital district, hospital authority, or extended care facility.

Health & Safety Code § 161.032(a), (c), (f). A “medical committee” is any committee, including a joint committee of a hospital, medical organization, university medical school or health science center, health maintenance organization, extended care facility, a hospital district, or a hospital authority. *See id.* § 161.031(a). The term also encompasses “a committee appointed *ad hoc* to conduct a specific investigation or established under state or federal law or rule or under the bylaws or rules of the organization or institution.” *Id.* § 161.031(b) (emphasis added).

The precise scope of the “medical committee” provision has been the subject of a number of judicial decisions. *See, e.g., Mem’l Hosp.—The Woodlands v. McCown*, 927 S.W.2d 1 (Tex. 1996); *Barnes v. Whittington*, 751 S.W.2d 493 (Tex. 1988); *Jordan v. Fourth Supreme Judicial Dist.*, 701 S.W.2d 644 (Tex. 1986). These cases establish “documents generated by the committee in order to conduct open and thorough review” are confidential. *Mem’l Hosp.*, 927 S.W.2d at 10; *Jordan*, 701 S.W.2d at 647-48; *Doctor’s Hosp. v. West*, 765 S.W.2d 812, 814 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1988, no writ). This protection extends “to documents that have been prepared by or at the direction of the committee for committee purposes.” *Jordan*, 701 S.W.2d at 647-48. Protection does not extend to documents “gratuitously submitted to a committee” or “created without committee impetus and purpose.” *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 591 (1991) (construing statutory predecessor to Health & Safety Code § 161.032). Additionally, we note section 161.032 does not make confidential “records made or maintained in the regular course of business by

a hospital[.]” Health & Safety Code § 161.032(f); *see also Mem’l Hosp.*, 927 S.W.2d at 10 (stating reference to statutory predecessor to section 160.007 of the Occupations Code in section 161.032 is clear signal records should be accorded same treatment under both statutes in determining if they were made in ordinary course of business). The phrase “records made or maintained in the regular course of business” has been construed to mean records that are neither created nor obtained in connection with a medical committee’s deliberative proceedings. *See Mem’l Hosp.*, 927 S.W.2d at 10 (discussing *Barnes*, 751 S.W.2d 493, and *Jordan*, 701 S.W.2d 644).

You assert some of the submitted information pertains to the system’s Sentinel Event Review Body (the “SERB”). You state the SERB includes the Director of Risk Management and Patient Safety and the Chief Medical Officer, and it takes action to reduce future related risk or harm. You state, and we agree, the SERB is a medical peer review committee under section 151.002(a)(8) of the Occupations Code. You also explain some of the information at issue was made at the behest of the system’s Credentialing Committee, a committee which evaluates the credentials of all applicants to the system. You state, and we agree, the Credentialing Committee is a medical committee for the purposes of section 161.031 of the Health and Safety Code. You state the information you have marked was prepared by or for or at the behest of members of the above mentioned medical committee or medical peer review committee for the purpose of fulfilling committee functions. Accordingly, we agree the information at issue consists of confidential records of a medical peer review committee and medical committee under section 160.007 of the Occupations Code and section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code.

You also contend the information you have marked consists of correspondence and information created by or exchanged between the members of the system’s medical committees and system employees who share privilege with the medical peer review committee and medical committee members because of their respective roles or knowledge in a particular subject matter or because the communication was at the behest of a committee member. You state the correspondence at issue was made in the furtherance of committee objectives and gathering information for the purpose of investigation. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the information you have marked consists of privileged records or information of the committees that are subject to sections 160.007 and 161.032. *Cf. Texarkana Mem’l Hosp., Inc. v. Jones*, 551 S.W.2d 33, 35 (Tex. 1977) (defining records made or maintained in regular course of business). Therefore, we conclude the system must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 160.007 of the Occupations Code and section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code.⁴

You claim section 552.107 of the Government Code for some of the remaining information. Section 552.107(1) protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See*

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Gov't Code § 552.107(1). The elements of the privilege under section 552.107(1) are the same as those discussed above for rule 503. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. ORD 676 at 6-7. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You assert the information you have marked was created and sent by system employees and attorneys for the system. You state the communications at issue were made for purposes of seeking and rendering legal advice to the system, were intended to remain confidential, and have not been disclosed to non-privileged parties. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Accordingly, the system may withhold the information you have marked in the remaining information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁵

Section 552.103 provides 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). The system has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas 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). The system must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

⁵As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

You state, and submit documentation showing, prior to the date of the instant request, a lawsuit styled *Perilla-Vargas v. Baylor College of Medicine*, Cause No. 2015-62240, was filed in the 80th District Court of Harris County. You state the system is named as a party to the lawsuit and the information at issue relates to the litigation because it relates to the alleged care and treatment of the plaintiff. Based on these representations, we find the system has demonstrated the information at issue is related to pending litigation. Therefore, the system may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.⁶

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. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

We note some of the remaining information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; see Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person 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.

In summary, the system may generally withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code you have marked under Texas Rule of Evidence 503; however, if these attachments are maintained by the system separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mails to which they are attached, the system may not withhold the marked attachments on that basis. The system must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code. The system may withhold the information you have marked in the remaining information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The system may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released; however, any information subject to copyright must be released in accordance with copyright law.

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.

⁶As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mili Gosar". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Mili Gosar
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MG/akg

Ref: ID# 597512

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mike Gerdes
EPIC Implementation Services
1979 Milky Way
Verona, Wisconsin 53593
(w/o enclosures)