



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 1, 2019

Mr. William Overton
Assistant General Counsel
Office of the General Counsel
Texas Department of Criminal Justice
P.O. Box 4004
Huntsville, Texas 77342-4004

OR2019-05806

Dear Mr. Overton:

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# 752941 (OGC# DT0107).

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice (the "department") received a request for all records related to a named inmate. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.108, 552.134, 552.136, and 552.147 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Initially, we note the submitted information contains grand jury subpoenas and information obtained pursuant to the grand jury subpoenas. The judiciary is expressly excluded from the requirements of the Act. Gov't Code § 552.003(1)(B). This office has determined for

¹Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 9 of article 42.12 of the Code Criminal Procedure, we note the 84th Legislature repealed this statute effective January 1, 2017. *See* Act of June 17, 2015, 84th Leg., R.S., ch. 770, §§ 3.01, 4.02, 2015 Tex. Gen. Laws 2320, 2395.

²We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

purposes of the Act, a grand jury is a part of the judiciary and therefore not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 411 (1984). Further, records kept by a governmental body that is acting as an agent for a grand jury are considered records in the constructive possession of the grand jury, and are also not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 513 (1988), 411,398 (1983). The fact that information collected or prepared by another person or entity is submitted to the grand jury does not necessarily mean such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession when the same information also is held in the other person's or entity's own capacity. Information held by another person or entity but not produced at the direction of the grand jury may well be protected under one of the Act's specific exceptions to disclosure, but such information is not excluded from the reach of the Act by the judiciary exclusion. *See* ORD 513. Thus, to the extent the department holds the information at issue solely as an agent of the grand jury, such information consists of records of the judiciary that are not subject to disclosure under the Act, and the department is not required to release that information in response to the instant request. To the extent the department holds the information at issue in its own capacity and not solely as an agent of the grand jury, we will address the argument against its disclosure.

Section 552.134 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) Except as provided by Subsection (b) or by Section 552.029, information obtained or maintained by the [department] is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if it is information about an inmate who is confined in a facility operated by or under a contract with the department.

(b) Subsection (a) does not apply to:

...

(2) information about an inmate sentenced to death.

Gov't Code § 552.134(a), (b)(2). You contend a portion of the submitted information falls within the scope of section 552.134. However, upon review, we find the information at issue pertains to a death row inmate. Section 552.134 is not applicable to inmates sentenced to death. *See id.* § 552.134(b)(2). Accordingly, the department may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.134.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses section 508.313(a) of the Government Code, which provides the following:

(a) All information obtained and maintained, including a victim protest letter or other correspondence, a victim impact statement, a list of inmates eligible

for release on parole, and an arrest record of an inmate, is confidential and privileged if the information relates to:

- (1) an inmate of the institutional division [of the department] subject to release on parole, release to mandatory supervision, or executive clemency;
- (2) a releasee; or
- (3) a person directly identified in any proposed plan of release for an inmate.

Id. § 508.313(a); *see id.* § 508.001(9) (“releasee” means a person released on parole or to mandatory supervision). The department states the information you indicated under section 552.101 consists of records of a releasee that are subject to section 508.313 of the Government Code. We understand the requestor is not authorized to obtain this information under section 508.313(c). *See id.* § 508.313(c). Further, there is no indication this information is made public under chapter 62 of the Code of Criminal Procedure or section 552.029 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 508.313(e), (f). Accordingly, the department must withhold the information you indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 508.313 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by statute, such as 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. 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). Upon review, we find the information we marked constitutes a record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that was created or is maintained by someone under the supervision of a physician. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.³ Upon review, we find none of the remaining information constitutes medical records subject to section 159.002. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses chapter 411 of the Government Code, which makes confidential criminal history record information (“CHRI”) generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center. *See* Gov’t Code § 411.083(a). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI that states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual laws with respect to the CHRI it generates. *See id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI that the Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains, except that DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F 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). Other entities specified in chapter 411 of the Government Code are entitled to obtain CHRI from DPS or another criminal justice agency; however, those entities may not release CHRI except as provided by chapter 411. *See generally id.* §§ 411.090-.127. Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with chapter 411, subchapter F of the Government Code. We note, because the laws governing the dissemination of information obtained from the NCIC or TCIC are based on both law enforcement and privacy interests, the CHRI of a deceased individual that is obtained from the DPS or another criminal justice agency may be disseminated only as permitted by subchapter F of chapter 411 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 565 at 10-12 (1990). We further note Federal Bureau of Investigation (“FBI”) numbers constitute CHRI generated by the FBI. Upon review, we find the information we marked consists of

³We note this ruling does not affect an individual’s right of access to his or her own medical records from the physician who provided treatment under the MPA, subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. *See* Occ. Code §§ 159.004, .005, .006; *cf. Abbott v. Tex. State Bd of Pharmacy*, 391 S.W.3d 253 (Tex. App.—Austin 2012, no pet.) (MPA does not provide general right of access to medical records from governmental body responding to a request for information under the Public Information Act).

CHRI which the department must withhold under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information consists of confidential CHRI. Therefore, the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining 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. Constitutional privacy protects two kinds of interests. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the “zones of privacy,” pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education, that have been recognized by the United States Supreme Court. *See Fadlo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981); ORD 455 at 3-7. The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985); ORD 455 at 6-7. This aspect of constitutional privacy balances the individual’s privacy interest against the public’s interest in the information. *See* ORD 455 at 7. Constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for “the most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 8 (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492).

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 that “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.” ORD 185. 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. 430 and 428, our office determined that inmate visitor and mail logs which 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. Further, we recognized that inmates had a constitutional right to visit with outsiders and could also be threatened if their names were released. *See also* ORD 185. The rights of those individuals to anonymity was found to outweigh the public’s interest in this information. *Id.*; *see* ORD 430 (list of inmate visitors protected by constitutional privacy of both inmate and visitors). Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the constitutional right to privacy. However, upon review, we find the

department has failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of constitutional privacy.

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* ORD 455. The court of appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See 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.). We note because the common-law right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death, common-law privacy does not protect information that relates only to a deceased individual. *See Moore*, 589 S.W.2d at 491; *see also* Attorney General Opinions JM-229; H-917; ORD 272. Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Thus, the department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the department has failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern, and the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. 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. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the

government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a *confidential* communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. 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).

The department explains the information it indicated consists of confidential communications between the department and Office of the General Counsel attorneys and staff that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. The department also asserts the communications were intended to be confidential and their confidentiality has been maintained. Upon review, we find the department has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information we marked. Therefore, the department may withhold the information we marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. Although you claim some of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information consists of privileged attorney-client communications for the purposes of section 552.107(1). Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). The department explains the submitted employee identification numbers are used to access government accounts and criminal databases. Based on this representation, we agree the department must withhold the submitted employee identification numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We understand you to raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (“HIPAA”) for the requested 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. 45 C.F.R. § 164.502(a).

This office addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act in 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 (2004); *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 department may not withhold any portion of the remaining information on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 560.003 of the Government Code, which provides, “[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under [the Act].” Gov’t Code § 560.003; *see id.* § 560.001(1) (“biometric identifier” means retina or iris scan, fingerprint, voiceprint, or record of hand or face geometry). Section 560.002 of the Government Code provides, in part, however, “[a] governmental body that possesses a biometric identifier of an individual ... may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose the biometric identifier to another person unless ...the individual consents to the disclosure[.]” *Id.* § 560.002(1)(A). We note the purpose of sections 560.001, 560.002, and 560.003 is to protect the privacy interests of individuals. Because the right of privacy lapses at death, biometric identifiers that pertain to a deceased individual may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis. *See Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S. W.2d 489,491 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref’d n.r.e.); *see also* Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984); H-917 (1976); Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981) (“the right of privacy is personal and lapses upon death”). The information at issue pertains to a deceased individual. Therefore, the fingerprints at issue are not confidential under section 560.003 of the

Government Code, and the department may not withhold them under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a]n internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution . . . if . . . release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1). Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). To prevail on its claim that section 552.108(b)(1) excepts information from disclosure, a governmental body must do more than merely make a conclusory assertion that releasing the information would interfere with law enforcement. Instead, the governmental body must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *See* Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990) (construing statutory predecessor). This office has concluded section 552.108(b) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 of the Government Code is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). Section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable, however, to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.*, ORDs 531 at 2-3 (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known). Upon review, we find the department failed to demonstrate release of the remaining information would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Consequently, the department may not withhold this information under section 552.108(b)(1).

Section 552.147(a) of the Government Code excepts the social security number of a living individual from public disclosure. Gov’t Code § 552.147(a). Accordingly, the department may not withhold the social security number of the deceased individual under section 552.147 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the department holds the information at issue solely as an agent of the grand jury, such information consists of records of the judiciary that are not subject to disclosure under the Act, and the department is not required to release that information in response to the instant request. The department must withhold the information you indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 508.313 of the Government Code. The department must withhold the information we marked under section

552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law. The department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the constitutional right to privacy. The department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department may withhold the information we marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The department must withhold the submitted employee identification numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The department must release the remaining 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/gw

Ref: ID# 752941

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)