



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 19, 2016

Mr. Pink Dickens
Assistant Criminal District Attorney
Victoria County Criminal District Attorney's Office
215 North Bridge Street, Suite 301
Victoria, Texas 77901-8085

OR2016-23546

Dear Mr. Dickens:

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# 630876.

The Victoria County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office") received a request for information pertaining to the requestor's client. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the Medical Practice Act ("MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part:

(a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(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(a)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004; Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). This office has concluded the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). We have also found when a file is created as the result of a hospital stay, all the documents in the file relating to diagnosis and treatment constitute physician-patient communications or “[r]ecords of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that are created or maintained by a physician.” Open Records Decision No. 546 (1990). Upon review, we find some of the submitted information constitutes confidential medical records subject to the MPA. Therefore, the sheriff's office must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.¹ Additionally, we note some of the remaining information, which we have marked, was created by a nurse. The sheriff's office must withhold these documents under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA only if they were created under the supervision of a physician. Accordingly, if the documents created by a nurse were not created under the supervision of a physician, they are not subject to the MPA and the sheriff's office may not withhold them under section 552.101 on that basis.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 411.083 of the Government Code, which pertains to criminal history record information (“CHRI”). CHRI generated by the National Crime Information Center (“NCIC”) or by the Texas Crime Information Center is confidential under federal and state law. CHRI means “information collected about a person by a criminal justice agency that consists of identifiable descriptions

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

²We note this ruling does not affect an individual's right of access to her own medical records from the physician who provided treatment under the MPA. *See* Occ. Code §§ 159.004-.006; *see also cf. Abbott v. Tex. State Bd. of Pharmacy*, 391 S.W.3d 253 (Tex. App.—Austin Nov. 21, 2012, no pet.) (MPA does not provide patient general right of access to his or her medical records from governmental body responding to request for information under Public Information Act).

and notations of arrests, detentions, indictments, informations, and other formal criminal charges and their dispositions.” *Id.* § 411.082(2). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI obtained from the NCIC network or other states. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 20.21. The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual law with respect to CHRI it generates. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990); *see generally* Gov’t Code ch. 411 subch. F. Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI the Texas Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains, except DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F, or subchapter E-1, of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 411.083. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Government Code chapter 411. You assert section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 for some of the submitted information. Upon review, however, we find you have failed to demonstrate the information at issue consists of confidential CHRI. Therefore, the sheriff’s office may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code on this basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy, which consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual’s interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual’s autonomy within “zones of privacy” which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual’s privacy interests and the public’s need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the “most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 5 (*citing Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)).

This office has applied privacy to protect certain information about incarcerated individuals. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 430 (1985), 428 (1985), 185 (1978). Citing *State v. Ellefson*, 224 S.E.2d 666 (S.C. 1976) as authority, this office held that those individuals who correspond with inmates possess a “first amendment right . . . to maintain communication with [the inmate] free of the threat of public exposure” and that this right would be violated by the release of information that identifies those correspondents, because such a release would discourage correspondence. ORD 185 at 2. The information at issue in Open Records Decision No. 185 was the identities of individuals who had corresponded with inmates, and our office found “the public’s right to obtain an inmate’s correspondence list is not sufficient to overcome the first amendment right of the inmate’s correspondents to maintain communication with him free of the threat of public exposure.” *Id.* Implicit in this holding is the fact that an individual’s association with an inmate may be intimate or embarrassing.

In Open Records Decision Nos. 428 and 430, our office determined that inmate visitor and mail logs that identify inmates and those who choose to visit or correspond with inmates are protected by constitutional privacy because people who correspond with inmates have a First Amendment right to do so that would be threatened if their names were released. ORDs 430, 428. The right of those individuals to anonymity was found to outweigh the public's interest in this information. ORD 185; *see* ORD 430 (list of inmate visitors protected by constitutional privacy of both inmate and visitors). Although the requestor represents the former inmate at issue, the requestor does not have a right of access to the information at issue under section 552.023 of the Government Code because the constitutional rights of the other party are also implicated. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to the person and is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests); *see also* ORD 430 (list of inmate visitors protected by constitutional privacy of both inmate and visitors). Accordingly, the sheriff's office must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy.³

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has also concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. In considering whether a public citizen's date of birth is private, the Third Court of Appeals looked to the supreme court's rationale in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of Texas*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). The supreme court concluded public employees' dates of birth are private under section 552.102 of the Government Code because the employees' privacy interest substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in disclosure.⁴ *Texas Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Texas Comptroller*, the court of appeals concluded the privacy rights of public employees apply equally to public citizens, and thus, public citizens' dates of birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3. *See* Open Records

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

⁴Section 552.102(a) exempts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a).

Decision No. 455 (1987). We note the requestor has a right of access to her client's private information pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See Gov't Code § 552.023(a)*; Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves).

Upon review, we conclude the information we have marked meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the sheriff's office must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. We note, however, although some of the remaining information contains the dates of birth of public citizens, the individuals to whom the information pertains have been de-identified and their privacy interests are, therefore, protected. Further, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern. Therefore, the sheriff's office may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release.⁵ *See Gov't Code § 552.130*. Accordingly, the sheriff's office must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the sheriff's office must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The sheriff's office must withhold the information created by a nurse, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA only if it was created under the supervision of a physician. The sheriff's office must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy. The sheriff's office must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The sheriff's office must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The sheriff's office must release the remaining information.⁶


⁵The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987)*.

⁶We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. *See Gov't Code § 552.023(a)*; ORD 481 at 4. Thus, the sheriff's office must again seek a decision from this office if it receives another request for the same information from another requestor.

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.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, appearing to read 'Meredith L. Coffman', with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/bw

Ref: ID# 630876

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)