



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 29, 2022

Ms. Amy L. Sims
Deputy City Attorney
City of Lubbock
P.O. Box 2000
Lubbock, Texas 79457

OR2022-22330

Dear Ms. Sims:

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# 963069 (ORR No. P001155-050522).

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

Initially, we note section 552.301(e)(1)(D) of the Government Code states a governmental body asking for an attorney general decision must, within fifteen business days of receiving a request, provide the attorney general with "a copy of the specific information requested, or *submit representative samples of information if a voluminous amount of information was requested.*" Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (emphasis added). We note the city submitted a voluminous amount of information, rather than a representative sample. We have reviewed a representative sample of the voluminous information submitted.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." *Id.* § 552.101. The city raises section 552.101 in conjunction with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") for some of the submitted information. At the direction of Congress, the Secretary of Health and Human Services

¹ To the extent the city identifies confidential information subject to a provision not addressed in this ruling, the city should contact the Open Government Hotline.

(“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, except as provided by parts 160 and 164 of the Code of Federal Regulations. *Id.* § 164.502(a).

This office has addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act. In Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004), 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 id.* § 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; *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 submitted information on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides the following:

[F]or a covered entity that is a governmental unit, an individual’s protected health information:

- (1) includes any information that reflects that an individual received health care from the covered entity; and
- (2) is not public information and is not subject to disclosure under [the Act].

Health & Safety Code § 181.006. Section 181.001(b)(2)(A) defines “covered entity” to include any person who

- (A) for commercial, financial, or professional gain, monetary fees, or dues, or on a cooperative, nonprofit, or pro bono basis, engages, in whole or in part, and with real or constructive knowledge, in the practice of assembling, collecting, analyzing, using, evaluating, storing, or transmitting protected health information. The term includes a business associate, health care payer, governmental unit, information or computer management entity,

school, health researcher, health care facility, clinic, health care provider, or person who maintains an Internet site[.]

Id. § 181.001(b)(2)(A). You assert the city is a covered entity for purposes of section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code. However, in order to determine whether the city is a covered entity, we must address whether the city engages in the practice of “assembling, collecting, analyzing, using, evaluating, storing, or transmitting protected health information.” *Id.* Section 181.001 states “[u]nless otherwise defined in this chapter, each term that is used in this chapter has the meaning assigned by the [HIPAA] and Privacy Standards.” *Id.* § 181.001(a). Accordingly, as chapter 181 does not define “protected health information,” we turn to HIPAA’s definition of the term. HIPAA defines “protected health information” as individually identifiable health information that is transmitted or maintained in electronic media or any other form or medium. *See* 45 C.F.R. § 160.103. HIPAA defines “individually identifiable health information” as information that is a subset of health information, including demographic information collected from an individual, and:

(1) Is created or received by a health care provider, health plan, employer, or health care clearinghouse; and

(2) Relates to the past, present, or future physical or mental health or condition of an individual; the provision of health care to an individual; or the past, present, or future payment for the provision of health care to an individual; and

(i) That identifies the individual; or

(ii) With respect to which there is a reasonable basis to believe the information can be used to identify the individual.

Id. Although you assert the city is a covered entity, you have not explained the submitted information consists of protected health information. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 560.003 of the Government Code, which provides, “[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under [the Act].” *Id.* § 560.003; *see id.* § 560.001(1) (“biometric identifier” means retina or iris scan, fingerprint, voiceprint, or record of hand or face geometry). The city does not inform us, and the information at issue does not indicate, section 560.002 permits the disclosure of the submitted fingerprint information. Therefore, the city must withhold the submitted fingerprints under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law informer's privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority. *See Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978)*. The informer's privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." *Open Records Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981)* (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton Rev. Ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988)*. However, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make a report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer's privilege. The privilege excepts the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity. *Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990)*. We note the informer's privilege does not apply where the informant's identity is known to the individual who is the subject of the complaint. *See ORD 208 at 1-2*.

The city states the submitted information contains the identifying information of complainants who reported possible criminal activities to the city's police department, which is a law enforcement agency. We note in some circumstances, where an oral statement is captured on tape and the voice of the informant is recognizable, it may be necessary to withhold the entire audio statement to protect the informant's identity. *Open Records Decision No. 434 at 2 (1986)*. Upon review, we conclude the city may withhold the information at issue, a representative sample of which we have marked, and the audio recordings we indicated in their entireties under section 552.101 in conjunction with the informer's privilege. However, we find the city has not demonstrated the remaining information at issue identifies an individual who reported a criminal violation to the city's police department for purposes of the informer's privilege. Accordingly, 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. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. 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, we note some of the information at issue pertains to individuals who are de-identified and whose privacy interests are, thus, protected. In addition, we note the information at issue includes the requestor's date of birth. The requestor has a right of access to this information. *See Gov't Code § 552.023(a)* (person or person's authorized representative has 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); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Therefore, with the exception of the requestor's date of birth, the city must withhold the information we have marked and all identified public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the remaining information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

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. Because section 552.130 protects personal privacy, the requestor has a right of access to his own motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information at issue, a representative sample of which we have marked, all visible license plates in the submitted video recordings and photographs, and all audible license plate numbers in the submitted video recordings and remaining audio recordings under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.147 of the Government Code provides that "[t]he social security number of a living person is excepted from" required public disclosure under the Act.² *Id.* § 552.147(a). Because section 552.147 protects personal privacy, the requestor has a right of access to her own social security numbers pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Accordingly, except for the requestor's social security number, the city may withhold the submitted social security numbers under section 552.147 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the submitted fingerprints under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information at issue, a representative sample of which we have marked, and the audio recordings we indicated in their entirety under section 552.101 in conjunction with the informer's privilege. With the exception of the requestor's date of birth, the city must withhold the information we have marked and all identified public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information at issue, a representative sample of which we have marked, all visible license plates in the submitted video recordings and photographs, and all audible license plate numbers in the submitted video recordings and remaining audio recordings under section 552.130 of the Government Code. With the exception for the requestor's social security number, the city may withhold the submitted social security numbers under section 552.147 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

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).

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/be

Ref: ID# 963069

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)