



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 7, 2022

Ms. Holli Clements
Deputy City Attorney
City of Killeen
P.O. Box 1329
Killeen, Texas 76540

OR2022-19463

Dear Ms. Clements:

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# 957996 (City ID #W038461).

The City of Killeen (the "city") received a request for a specified police report. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, 552.130, 552.137, and 552.147 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the city's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). Further, pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body must submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *See id.* § 552.301(e). The city received the request for information

¹ Although you do not raise section 552.137 of the Government Code in your brief, we understand you to raise this exception based on your markings.

on February 28, 2022. You do not inform us the city was closed for any business days between February 28, 2022, and March 21, 2022. Accordingly, you were required to provide the information required by section 552.301(b) by March 14, 2022. Moreover, you were required to provide the information required by section 552.301(e) by March 21, 2022. However, the envelope in which the city provided the information required by sections 552.301(b) and 552.301(e) was postmarked April 28, 2022. *See id.* § 552.308(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Accordingly, we conclude the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). The city claims sections 552.101, 552.108, 552.130, 552.137, and 552.147 of the Government Code for the submitted information. Because sections 552.101, 552.130, and 552.137 can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address your arguments under these sections for the submitted information.² However, we find you have failed to establish a compelling reason to address your remaining exceptions.

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 information made confidential by statute, such as the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. *See* Occ. Code §§ 151.001-168.202. 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.

² We note section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental 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). However, in this instance, the requestor has a right of access to his own social security number and it must be released to him. *See generally id.* § 552.023(b) (person or person's authorized representative has a special right of access to records that contain information relating to the person that are protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests).

(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 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). We have further found when a file is created as a result of a hospital stay, all the documents in the file referring to diagnosis and treatment constitute physician-patient communications.

Upon review, we find a portion of the submitted information, which 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 a physician and information obtained from a patient's medical records. Accordingly, the city must withhold the marked medical records under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.³ However, we find you have not demonstrated any portion of the remaining information consists of medical records for purposes of the MPA, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

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 highly intimate or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. The 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.). This office has also found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). Additionally, 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. United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that

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

individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). 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 concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). We note the requestor has a right of access to his own otherwise private information under section 552.023 of the Government Code. *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).

Upon review, we find the information we marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth that do not belong to the requestor and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining information you have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find portions of the remaining information consist of motor vehicle record information. We note section 552.130 protects personal privacy. Accordingly, the requestor has a right of access to his own motor vehicle record information under section 552.023 of the Government Code and it may not be withheld under section 552.130. *See id.* § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Accordingly, with the exception of the requestor's driver's license number, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information you marked, the additional information we marked, and all visible license plates in the submitted photographs 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* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). We note the requestor has a right to his own e-mail address under section 552.137(b). *Id.* § 552.137(b). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the requestor's e-mail address under section 552.137.

In summary, the city must withhold the marked medical records under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth that do not belong to the requestor and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. With the exception of the requestor's driver's license number, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information you marked, the additional information we marked, and

all visible license plates in the submitted photographs under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city 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 <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,

Nick Ybarra
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NY/be

Ref: ID# 957996

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)