



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 10, 2017

Ms. Danielle R. Folsom
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2017-23067

Dear Ms. Folsom:

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# 679713 (GC No. 24513).

The City of Houston (the "city") received two requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to a specified taxicab medallion. You state you released some information. You state the city will withhold access device numbers pursuant to section 552.136(c) of the Government Code, certain information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), and dates of birth pursuant to the previous determinations issued in Open Records Letter No. 2017-00878 (2017).¹ 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.

¹Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. Open Records Letter No. 2017-00878 authorizes the city to withhold dates of birth of members of the public under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and employees' dates of birth under section 552.102 of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting an attorney general's decision.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses section 201.402 of the Occupations Code, which provides, in part, the following:

(a) Communications between a chiropractor and a patient relating to or in connection with any professional services provided by a chiropractor to the patient are confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this subchapter.

(b) Records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a chiropractor that are created or maintained by a chiropractor are confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this subchapter.

(c) A person who receives information from the confidential communications or records, excluding a person listed in Section 201.404(a) 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 § 201.402(a)-(c). Upon review, we find some of the submitted information consists of chiropractic records subject to section 201.402 of the Occupations Code. Thus, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 201.402 of the Occupations Code.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Medical Practice Act (the “MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. *See id.* §§ 151.001-168.202. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in relevant part the following:

(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.

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

(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.

Id. § 159.002(a)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. 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 at 3-4 (1988), 370 at 2 (1983), 343 at 1 (1982). Some of the information at issue consists of reports of the results of drug tests. Section 159.001 of the MPA defines "patient" as a person who consults with or is seen by a physician to receive medical care. Occ. Code § 159.001(3). Because the individual at issue did not receive medical care in the administration of the drug tests, this individual is not a patient for purposes of section 159.002. Upon review, we find the information we marked constitutes medical records. As such, the city must withhold the marked medical records under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. However, we find none of the remaining information constitutes confidential medical records for the purposes of the MPA. Consequently, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on this basis.

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. A compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Furthermore, we find that a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. This office has also found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information,

participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). Upon review, we find portions of the remaining information satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Thus, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

You state the city will redact motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.³ Section 552.130 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Therefore, the city must withhold the information you marked, and the additional information we marked, under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 201.402 of the Occupations Code. The city must withhold the medical records we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information you marked, and the additional information we marked, under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.⁴

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/>

³Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e).

⁴We note the remaining information contains a social security number. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

[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,



Matthew Taylor
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MHT/tdw

Ref: ID# 679713

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)