



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 28, 2018

Ms. Andrea D. Russell
Counsel for the City of Haltom City
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam, L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107-4654

OR2018-04661

Dear Ms. Russell:

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# 697625 (PIR# 1915).

The City of Haltom City (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all information regarding a specified incident. You state the city will withhold motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ You also state the city will withhold certain information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).² You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

¹Section 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). 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. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

²Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides in part:

(b) Records of the identity, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by emergency medical services personnel or by a physician providing medical supervision that are created by the emergency medical services personnel or physician or maintained by an emergency medical services provider are confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

...

(g) The privilege of confidentiality under this section does not extend to information regarding the presence, nature of injury or illness, age, sex, occupation, and city of residence of a patient who is receiving emergency medical services.

Health & Safety Code § 773.091(b), (g). Except for the information specified in section 773.091(g), emergency medical services (“EMS”) records are deemed confidential under section 773.091 and may only be released in accordance with chapter 773 of the Health and Safety Code. *See id.* §§ 773.091-.094. You state the submitted information reflects the treatment of a patient by EMS personnel. Upon review, we find that the submitted information does not reflect the identity, evaluation, or treatment of a patient for purposes of section 773.091. Therefore, the submitted information may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091.

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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find no portion of the submitted information is highly intimate or embarrassing information of an individual that is of no legitimate public concern. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy. As you raise no other exceptions to disclosure, the city must release the submitted information.

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,



Emily Buchanan
Attorney
Open Records Division

EB/som

Ref: ID# 697625

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)