



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 7, 2020

Mr. Nathan Christopher  
Assistant General Counsel  
Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center  
3601 4<sup>th</sup> Street STOP 6246, Suite 2B141  
Lubbock, Texas 79430-6246

OR2020-00478

Dear Mr. Christopher:

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# 803736.

The Texas Tech University Health Sciences Center (the "university") received a request for all material submitted to the California Board of Medicine relating to the requestor.<sup>1</sup> 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.

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. Section 552.101 encompasses section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code. Section 161.032 addresses a broad category of medical committees and provides, in relevant part, the following:

- (a) The records and proceedings of a medical committee are confidential and are not subject to court subpoena.

---

<sup>1</sup> We note the university sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

...

(c) Records, information, or reports of a medical committee, medical peer review committee, or compliance officer and records, information, or reports provided by a medical committee, medical peer review committee, or compliance officer to the governing body of a public hospital, hospital district, or hospital authority are not subject to disclosure under [the Act].

...

(f) This section and Subchapter A, Chapter 160, Occupations Code, do not apply to records made or maintained in the regular course of business by a hospital, health maintenance organization, medical organization, university medical center or health science center, hospital district, hospital authority, or extended care facility.

Health & Safety Code § 161.032(a), (c), (f). A “medical committee” is any committee, including a joint committee of a hospital, medical organization, university medical school or health science center, health maintenance organization, extended care facility, a hospital district, or a hospital authority. *See id.* § 161.031(a). The term also encompasses “a committee appointed *ad hoc* to conduct a specific investigation or established under state or federal law or rule or under the bylaws or rules of the organization or institution.” *Id.* § 161.031(b) (emphasis added).

The precise scope of the “medical committee” provision has been the subject of a number of judicial decisions. *See, e.g., Mem’l Hosp.—The Woodlands v. McCown*, 927 S.W.2d 1 (Tex. 1996); *Barnes v. Whittington*, 751 S.W.2d 493 (Tex. 1988); *Jordan v. Fourth Supreme Judicial Dist.*, 701 S.W.2d 644 (Tex. 1986). These cases establish “documents generated by the committee in order to conduct open and thorough review” are confidential. *Mem’l Hosp.*, 927 S.W.2d at 10; *Jordan*, 701 S.W.2d at 647-48; *Doctor’s Hosp. v. West*, 765 S.W.2d 812, 814 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1988, no writ). This protection extends “to documents that have been prepared by or at the direction of the committee for committee purposes.” *Jordan*, 701 S.W.2d at 647-48. Protection does not extend to documents “gratuitously submitted to a committee” or “created without committee impetus and purpose.” *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 591 (1991) (construing statutory predecessor to Health & Safety Code § 161.032). Additionally, we note section 161.032 does not make confidential “records made or maintained in the regular course of business by a hospital[.]” Health & Safety Code § 161.032(f); *see also Mem’l Hosp.*, 927 S.W.2d at 10 (stating reference to statutory predecessor to section 160.007 of the Occupations Code in section 161.032 is clear signal records should be accorded same treatment under both statutes in determining if they were made in ordinary course of business). The phrase “records made or maintained in the regular course of business” has been construed to mean records that are neither created nor obtained in connection with a medical committee’s deliberative proceedings. *See Mem’l Hosp.*, 927 S.W.2d at 10 (discussing *Barnes*, 751 S.W.2d 493, and *Jordan*, 701 S.W.2d 644).

You state the submitted information was “created in response to [the requestor’s] request that the [university] Family Medicine Residency Program fill out the Certificate of Completion of ACGME/RCPSC Postgraduate Training and send to the Medical Board of California to qualify for licensure in California.” You also explain the Clinical Competency Committee’s evaluation, decision, and review of the requestor’s performance as a resident in the Family Medicine Residency Program at the university was relied on to provide the California Medical Board a certification of the requestor’s professional performance. However, we find you have not demonstrated any portion of the information at issue consists of confidential records of a medical committee under section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code. *Cf. Texarkana Mem’l Hosp., Inc. v. Jones*, 551 S.W.2d 33, 35 (Tex. 1977) (defining records made or maintained in regular course of business). Accordingly, the university may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code. The university must release the submitted information to this requestor.<sup>2</sup>

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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



D. Michelle Case  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DMC/jxd

---

<sup>2</sup> We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person’s agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Thus, if the university receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the university must again seek a decision from this office.

Mr. Nathan Christopher - Page 4

Ref: ID# 803736

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)