



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 6, 2019

Ms. June B. Harden
Assistant Attorney General
Assistant Public Information Coordinator
Office of the Attorney General
P.O. Box 12548
Austin, Texas 78711-2548

OR2019-12053

Dear Ms. Harden:

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# 762911 (PIR No. R000319).

The Office of the Attorney General (the "OAG") received a request for all records pertaining to a specified incident. The OAG states it will release some of the requested information, including basic information, pursuant to section 552.108(c) of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(c). The OAG states it will redact information subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code pursuant to section 552.024(c) of the Government Code and information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ Further, the OAG states it will redact employees' dates of birth pursuant to Open Records Letter No. 2016-11398 (2016) and certain information subject to section 552.139 of the Government

¹Section 552.024(c)(2) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting a decision under the Act if the current or former employee or official to whom the information pertains timely chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.024(c)(2). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with subsections 552.024(c-1) and (c-2). *See id.* § 552.024(c-1)-(c-2). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold specific categories of information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

Code, which we understand it will do in accordance with Open Records Letter Nos. 2011-18124 (2011) and 2016-21830 (2016).² The OAG claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions the OAG asserts and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

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 information made confidential by other statutes, 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 that is subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This

²In Open Records Letter No. 2016-11398, this office issued the OAG a previous determination authorizing the OAG to withhold employees’ dates of birth under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting an attorney general’s decision. In Open Records Letter No. 2011-18124, this office issued the OAG a previous determination authorizing it to withhold an employee’s user identification under section 552.139 of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. In Open Records Letter No. 2016-21830, this office issued the OAG a previous determination authorizing it to withhold photographs of its employees created specifically for use on identification badges under section 552.139(b)(3) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office.

³We 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

office has determined 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 that 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 the information at issue constitutes confidential medical records under the MPA. Accordingly, the OAG must withhold the information it indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is 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. 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 the information the OAG marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the OAG must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.107(1). 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate 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. *See* 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. *See 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 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. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). 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. Finally,

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. *See 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 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 OAG states Exhibit C consists of communications between attorneys and staff of various OAG divisions. The OAG states the communications were made for the purpose of providing and receiving professional legal advice regarding a specific personnel matter. The OAG states these communications were not intended to be disclosed and have not been disclosed to non-privileged parties. Based on the OAG’s representations and our review, we find the OAG has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to Exhibit C. Thus, the OAG may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. *See Gov’t Code* § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). The OAG states Exhibit B consists of investigative records compiled by the OAG’s Criminal Investigations Division. The OAG explains the criminal investigation at issue is closed and no charges were filed. Based on these representations and our review, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to Exhibit B. Accordingly, the OAG may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

In summary, the OAG must withhold the information it indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The OAG must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The OAG may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The OAG may withhold Exhibit B under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The OAG 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,



Paige Thompson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PT/eb

Ref: ID# 762911

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)