



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 12, 2020

Ms. Patricia A. Rigney
City Attorney
City of Pharr
P.O. Box 1729
Pharr, Texas 78577

OR2020-28458

Dear Ms. Rigney:

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# 852537 (PIR# R001684-090220).

The City of Pharr (the "city") received a request for separation of employment records and disciplinary records generated during a specified time period. 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 "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code §552.101. This section encompasses the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") for portions of the submitted 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 has addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act. 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 information at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with HIPAA.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 402.083(a) of the Labor Code, which provides “[i]nformation in or derived from a claim file regarding an employee is confidential and may not be disclosed by the [Division of Workers’ Compensation for the Texas Department of Insurance (the “division”)] except as provided by this subtitle or other law.” Labor Code § 402.083(a). In Open Records Decision No. 533 (1989), this office construed the predecessor to section 402.083(a) to apply only to information the governmental body obtained from the Industrial Accident Board, subsequently the Texas Workers’ Compensation Commission, and now the division. *See* ORD 533 at 3-6; *see also* Labor Code § 402.086 (transferring confidentiality conferred by section 402.083(a) of the Labor Code to information other parties obtain from division files). Additionally, this office has interpreted section 402.083 to generally protect only “information in or derived from a claim file that explicitly or implicitly discloses the identities of employees who file workers’ compensation claims.” Open Records Decision No. 619 at 10 (1993). However, we also have stated, “[w]hether specific information implicitly discloses the identity of a particular employee must be determined on a case-by-case basis.” *Id.* Based on this analysis, we find information in the possession of the city that was not obtained from the division may not be withheld on the basis of section 402.083 of the Labor Code. Although you assert the submitted information is confidential pursuant to section 402.083, you provide no representation, and the documents do not reflect, the city received these records from the division. Therefore, you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 402.083 to the information at issue. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 402.083(a) of the Labor Code.

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). Upon review, we find some of the submitted information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “Notwithstanding 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.”¹ Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); see *id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must: (1) withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (2) withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code; and (3) 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 <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,

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/rm

Ref: ID# 852537

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

¹ The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).