



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 9, 2019

Ms. Barbara Boulware-Wells
Counsel for City of Milano
The Knight Law Firm, LLP
223 West Anderson Lane, Suite a-105
Austin, Texas 78752

OR2019-09554

Dear Ms. Boulware-Wells:

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# 758679.

The City of Milano (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for four categories of information, including specified minutes, particular rules and procedures, and information pertaining to particular subjects. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.130, 552.136, and 552.147 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the city has not submitted information responsive to all of the categories of information to which the requestor seeks access. Although the city states it has submitted a representative sample of the requested information, we find the submitted information is not representative of all the types of information at issue. Please be advised, this open records letter ruling applies only to the types of information you have submitted for our review. This ruling does not authorize the city to withhold any information that is substantially different from the types of information the city submitted to this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302 (where request for attorney general decision does not comply with

¹Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 405(c)(2)(C)(vii) of title 42 of the United States Code to withhold social security numbers, we note that section 552.147 of the Government Code is the proper exception to raise for this information.

requirements of Gov't Code § 552.301, information at issue is presumed to be public). Accordingly, to the extent any such information existed on the date the city received the request, we assume the city has released it. If the city has not released any such information, it must do so at this time. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; see also Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 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. The Third 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.). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). This office has also found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision No. 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). However, there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. See *id.* (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common-law privacy). However, the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death and the common-law right to privacy does not encompass information that relates only to a deceased individual. *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); see also *Justice v. Belo Broadcasting Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 147 (N.D. Tex. 1979) (“action for invasion of privacy can be maintained only by a living individual whose privacy is invaded” (quoting RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS § 652I (1977))); Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) (“the right of privacy lapses upon death”), H-917 (1976) (“We are . . . of the opinion that the Texas courts would follow the almost uniform rule of other jurisdictions that the right of privacy lapses upon death.”); Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981) (“the right of privacy is personal and lapses upon death”). Accordingly, information pertaining to a deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law privacy grounds. We note common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals, not those of corporate and other business entities. See Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy),

192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); *see also Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989) (corporation has no right to privacy (citing *United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950))), *rev'd on other grounds*, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990). We also note an individual's name, education, prior employment, and personal information are not ordinarily private information subject to common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 554 (1990), 448 (1986).

In Open Records Decision No. 373 (1983), this office determined financial information submitted by applicants for federally-funded housing rehabilitation loans and grants was "information deemed confidential" by a common-law right of privacy. The financial information at issue in Open Records Decision No. 373 included sources of income, salary, mortgage payments, assets, medical and utility bills, social security and veterans benefits, retirement and state assistance benefits, and credit history. Additionally, in Open Records Decision No. 523 (1989), we held the credit reports, financial statements, and financial information included in loan files of individual veterans participating in the Veterans Land Program were excepted from disclosure by the common-law right of privacy. Similarly, we thus conclude financial information relating to an applicant for housing assistance satisfies the first requirement of common-law privacy, in that it constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing facts about the individual, such that its public disclosure would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities.

The second requirement of the common-law privacy test requires the information not be of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 668. While the public generally has some interest in knowing whether public funds expended for housing assistance are being given to qualified applicants, we believe ordinarily this interest will not be sufficient to justify the invasion of the applicant's privacy that would result from disclosure of information concerning his or her financial status. *See* ORD 373 (although any record maintained by governmental body is arguably of legitimate public interest, if only relation of individual to governmental body is as applicant for housing rehabilitation grant, second requirement of common-law privacy test not met). In particular cases, a requestor may demonstrate the existence of a public interest that will overcome the second requirement of the common-law privacy test. However, whether there is a public interest in this information sufficient to justify its disclosure must be decided on a case-by-case basis. *See* ORDs 523, 373.

Open Records Decision Nos. 373 and 523 draw a distinction between the confidential "background financial information furnished to a public body about an individual" and "the basic facts regarding a particular financial transaction between the individual and the public body." Open Records Decision Nos. 523, 385 (1983). Subsequent decisions of this office analyze questions about the confidentiality of background financial information consistently with Open Records Decision No. 373. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545, 523, 481 (individual financial information concerning applicant for public

employment is closed), 480 (names of students receiving loans and amounts received from Texas Guaranteed Student Loan Corporation are public); *see also* Attorney General Opinions H-1070 (1977), H-15 (1973) (laws requiring financial disclosure by public officials and candidates for office do not invade their privacy rights). *But see* Open Records Decision No. 602 at 5 (1992) (records related to salaries of those employees for whom the city pays a portion are subject to the Act). We note, however, this office has concluded the names and present addresses of current or former residents of a public housing development are not protected from disclosure under the common-law right to privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 318 (1982). Likewise, the amounts paid by a housing authority on behalf of eligible tenants are not protected from disclosure under privacy interests. *See* Open Records Decision No. 268 (1981); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9-10, 545, 489 (1987), 480. Whether the public has a legitimate interest in an individual's sources of income must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* ORD 373 at 4; *see also* ORDs 600, 545. Upon review, we find the information we marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked and all living public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.² However, the city has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is subject to common-law privacy, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy 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. ORD 455 at 4. 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)). After review of the remaining information, we find the city has failed to demonstrate any portion of the information at issue falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the city 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 information protected by other statutes, such as section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. Section 6103(a) renders tax return information confidential. Attorney General Opinion H-1274 (1978) (tax

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

returns); Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (W-4 forms). Section 6103(b) defines the term “return information” as the following:

[A] taxpayer’s identity, the nature, source, or amount of his income, payments, receipts, deductions, exemptions, credits, assets, liabilities, net worth, tax liability, tax withheld, deficiencies, overassessments, or tax payments . . . or any other data, received by, recorded by, prepared by, furnished to, or collected by the Secretary [of the Treasury] with respect to a return or with respect to the determination of the existence, or possible existence, of liability . . . for any tax, penalty, interest, fine, forfeiture, or other imposition, or offense[.]

26 U.S.C. § 6103(b)(2)(A). Federal courts have construed the term “return information” expansively to include any information gathered by the Internal Revenue Service regarding a taxpayer’s liability under title 26 of the United States Code. *See Mallas v. Kolak*, 721 F. Supp. 748, 754 (M.D.N.C. 1989), *dismissed in part, aff’d in part, vacated in part, and remanded*, 993 F.2d 1111 (4th Cir. 1993). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States 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 city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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. 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. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.

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. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.130(a). Thus, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. However, you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue is subject to section 552.130. Thus, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.130 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.” *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136.

Accordingly, the city must withhold the routing and bank account numbers, as well as the insurance policy numbers, in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. However, we find you have not explained how any of the remaining information consists of a credit card, debit card, or charge card number, or is an access device number used to obtain money, goods, services, or any item of value, or used to initiate the transfer of funds. *See id.* §§ 552.136(a), .301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies). Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.136 of the Government Code to the remaining information and the city may not withhold it on this ground.

Section 552.147(a) of the Government Code excepts the social security number of a living individual from public disclosure. *Id.* § 552.147(a). Therefore, a social security number that pertains solely to a deceased individual may not be withheld under section 552.147. Accordingly, with the exception of the social security numbers belonging to the deceased individuals, the city may withhold the social security numbers within the remaining information under section 552.147 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information may be subject to copyright law. 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 city must withhold the information we have marked and all living public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the routing and bank account numbers, as well as the insurance policy numbers, in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. With the exception of the social security numbers belonging to the deceased individuals, the city may withhold the social security numbers within the remaining information under section 552.147 of the Government Code. The city must release the

remaining information; however, any information protected by copyright may only 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.

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 "Erin Groff". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/gw

Ref: ID# 758679

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)