



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 3, 2020

Mr. Nicholas Toulet
Assistant City Attorney
City of Midland
P.O. Box 1152
Midland, Texas 79702

OR2020-30131

Dear Mr. Toulet:

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# 856010 (M031373-090920 and M031380-090920).

The City of Midland (the "city") received two requests from the same requestor for a call log listing all incidents that occurred at a specified location during a specified time and information pertaining to fifty-four specified incidents. 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.

Initially, we note portions of the submitted information, which we have marked, are not responsive to the instant request because they do not consist of the requested call log and do not pertain to the fifty-four specified incidents. The city need not release non-responsive information in response to this request, and this ruling will not address that information.¹

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from 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 58.008 of the Family Code, which provides, in part:

(b) Except as provided by Subsection (c), law enforcement records concerning a child and information concerning a child that are stored by

¹ As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

electronic means or otherwise and from which a record could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

- (1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult records;
- (2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as adult records, accessible only under controls that are separate and distinct from the controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and
- (3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subsection (c) or Subchapter B, D, or E.

Fam. Code § 58.008(b); *see also id.* § 51.03(a)-(b) (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). Section 58.008(b) is applicable to records of juvenile conduct that occurred before, on, or after September 1, 2017. *See* Act of May 28, 2017, 85th Leg., R.S., ch. 746, § 22, 2017 Tex. Sess. Law Serv. 3173, 3187. The juvenile must have been at least 10 years old and less than 17 years of age when the conduct occurred. *See* Fam. Code § 51.02(2) (defining “child” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). We find the information we marked involves a juvenile offender, so as to fall within the scope of section 58.008(b). It does not appear that any of the exceptions in section 58.008 apply; therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(b) of the Family Code.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. Section 261.201(a) provides as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act] and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

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

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

Id. § 261.201(a). Although you raise section 261.201 for portions of the remaining responsive information, you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the information at issue was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under section 261.201(a)(2). Furthermore, you have not established the information is a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under section 261.201(a)(1). *See id.* § 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of Fam. Code ch. 261). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(b) Records of the identity, evaluation or treatment of a patient by emergency medical services personnel or by a physician providing medical supervision that are created by the emergency medical services personnel or physician or maintained by an emergency medical services provider are confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

...

(g) The privilege of confidentiality under this section does not extend to information regarding the presence, nature of injury or illness, age, sex, occupation, and city of residence of a patient who is receiving emergency medical services.

Health & Safety Code § 773.091(b), (g). Except for the information specified in section 773.091(g), emergency medical services (“EMS”) records are deemed confidential under section 773.091. Upon review, we find none of the remaining information constitutes records of the identity, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by EMS personnel. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091(b) of the Health and Safety Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Medical Practice Act (the “MPA”, which governs access to medical records. Occ. Code §§ 151.001-168.202. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides:

(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.

Id. § 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 office has concluded that 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 further 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). The information we have marked consists of medical records subject to the MPA. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 159.002 of the Occupations Code.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). 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.). However, because privacy is a personal right that lapses at death, the common-law right to privacy does not encompass information that relates only to a deceased individual. Accordingly, information pertaining to a deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law privacy grounds. *See 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* Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981) (privacy rights lapse upon death).

Upon review, we find portions of the remaining information satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the types of information we indicated, a representative sample of which we have marked, and public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy to the extent this information relates to living and identifiable individuals. However, we note some of the information at issue pertains to individuals who will be de-identified and whose privacy interests are, thus, protected. Further, we find you have

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

failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information pertains to living individuals and is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information that relates to a motor vehicle operator's license or driver's license or a motor vehicle title or registration issued by a Texas agency, or an agency of another state or country.⁴ *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1)-(2). We note that because the right of privacy lapses at death, driver's license information that pertains solely to a deceased individual may not be withheld under section 552.130. *See Moore*, 589 S.W.2d at 291; *see also* Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984), H-917 (1976); ORD 272 at 1. Upon review, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(b) of the Family Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 159.002 of the Occupations Code. The city must withhold the types of information we indicated, a representative sample of which we have marked, and public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy to the extent this information relates to living and identifiable individuals. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining responsive 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,

Jennifer Copeland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JC/jm

⁴ The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Mr. Nicholas Toulet - Page 6

Ref: ID# 856010

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)