



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 14, 2020

Ms. Erin Ham
Deputy City Clerk
City of Wichita Falls
P.O. Box 1431
Wichita Falls, Texas 76307

OR2020-04848

Dear Ms. Ham:

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# 812091 (City# 1175).

The Wichita Falls Police Department (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to a specified case number. You state the department has released some information. 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 48.101 of the Human Resources Code, which pertains to the disclosure of reports of abuse, neglect, or exploitation of elderly and disabled persons in certain facilities. Section 48.101 provides, in pertinent part:

(a) The following information is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act]:

- (1) a report of abuse, neglect, or exploitation made under this chapter;
- (2) the identity of the person making the report: and
- (3) except as provided by this section, all files, reports, records, communications, and working papers used or developed in an investigation made under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

(b) Confidential information may be disclosed only for a purpose consistent with this chapter and as provided by [the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (the “DFPS”)] or investigating state agency rule and applicable federal law.

Hum. Res. Code § 48.101(a), (b). Section 48.051 of the Human Resources Code provides “a person having cause to believe that an elderly or disabled person is in the state of abuse, neglect, or exploitation” shall report certain prescribed information to the DFPS or another appropriate state agency. *See id.* § 48.051(a). We note the only entities authorized to conduct an investigation under chapter 48 of the Human Resources Code are the DFPS and certain other state agencies, depending on the circumstances surrounding the incident.¹ *See id.* §§ 48.151, .152, .252, .301. Thus, section 48.101 is generally not applicable to records of an investigation conducted by a police department. Upon review, we find a portion of the responsive information, which we have marked, constitutes files, reports, records, communications, and working papers used or developed in an investigation made under chapter 48 of the Human Resources Code. Such information must not be released to the public, except for a purpose consistent with chapter 48 and as provided by DFPS or investigating state agency rule or federal law. *See id.* § 48.101(b). *But see id.* § 48.101(c)-(f) (permitting release of confidential information in certain circumstances). The department does not indicate, nor does it appear, an exception to confidentiality applies in this instance. Accordingly, we conclude the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 48.101 of the Human Resources Code.² However, we find the department has not demonstrated any of the remaining responsive information was used or developed in an investigation conducted under chapter 48 of the Human Resources Code. *See id.* § 48.101(a)(3). We therefore conclude the department may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 48.101 of the Human Resources Code.

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.

¹ In 2005, the Department of Protective and Regulatory Services was renamed the Department of Family and Protective Services. *See* Act of May 29, 2005, 79th Leg., R.S., ch. 268, §§ 1.74, 1.75, 2005 Tex. Gen. Laws 621, 661.

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

(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 have marked constitutes records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that were created or are maintained by someone under the supervision of a physician. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.³

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). A compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. U.S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (finding significant privacy interest in compilation of individual's criminal history by recognizing distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of criminal history information). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. This office has also found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (personal financial information includes choice of particular insurance carrier), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). The Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *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.). However, because "the right of privacy is purely personal," that right "terminates upon the death of the person whose privacy is invaded." *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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”). Thus, information pertaining solely to a deceased individual may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the department must withhold the dates of birth of living individuals and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the department has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s or 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.⁴ Gov’t Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the department must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address of a vendor who seeks to contract with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body on a letterhead. *See id.* § 552.137(c). Upon review, we find the department must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to their public disclosure.

In summary, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 48.101 of the Human Resources Code. The department must withhold the information we have marked under

⁴ The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The department must withhold the dates of birth of living individuals and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The department must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to their public disclosure. The department must release the remaining information.⁵

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,



Kelly McWethy
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KM/gw

Ref: ID# 812091

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁵ We note the remaining information includes social security numbers. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a government body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Gov't Code § 552.147(b).