



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 13, 2022

Ms. Alicia K. Kreh
Counsel for the City of Archer City
Taylor, Olson, Adkins, Sralla, Elam, L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2022-31573

Dear Ms. Kreh:

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# 978313.

The City of Archer City (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to two named individuals. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

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. This section encompasses section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides, in part, the following:

- (a) A communication between certified emergency medical services [{"EMS"}] personnel or a physician providing medical supervision and a patient that is made in the course of providing emergency medical services to the patient is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (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(a)-(b), (g). The city asserts the submitted information contains records made and maintained by emergency medical services personnel. However, we note the information at issue reveals the individual concerned was deceased when emergency medical services personnel arrived. The term “patient” is not defined for the purposes of section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code. When a word used in a statute is not defined and that word is “connected with and used with reference to a particular trade or subject matter or is used as a word of art, the word shall have the meaning given by experts in the particular trade, subject matter, or art.” Gov’t Code § 312.002; *see also Liberty Mut. Ins. Co. v. Garrison Contractors, Inc.*, 966 S.W.2d 482, 485 (Tex. 1998). Taber’s Cyclopedic Medical Dictionary defines “patient” as “one who is sick with, or being treated for, an illness or injury; [or] . . . an individual receiving medical care.” Taber’s Cyclopedic Medical Dictionary 1446 (17th ed. 1989). We also note other statutes dealing with medically-related professions generally define “patient” as an individual who consults a health care professional. *See* Health & Safety Code § 611.001 (mental health records), Occ. Code §§ 159.001 (physician records), 201.401 (chiropractic records), 202.401 (podiatric records), 258.101 (dental records). Thus, because the generally accepted medical definition of patient indicates the term refers to a living individual, we find the term does not encompass information that concerns a deceased individual. Accordingly, we conclude section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code is not applicable to the information at issue and the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted 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 intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in the *Industrial Foundation* decision. *Id.* at 683. 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.). Nevertheless, 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 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. Civ.

App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); *see also Justice v. Belo Broad. 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 § 6521 (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”). The requestor has a right of access to her own date of birth pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See Gov’t Code* § 552.023(a) (“[a] person or a person’s authorized representative has a special right of access, beyond the right of the general public, to information held by a governmental body that relates to the person and that is 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 individuals request information concerning themselves). Nevertheless, the city must withhold the submitted dates of birth of living individuals that do not pertain to the requestor 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 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. However, the city must withhold the information marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code that does not pertain to the requestor.

In summary, the city must withhold the submitted dates of birth of living individuals that do not pertain to the requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must also withhold the information marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code that does not pertain to the requestor. The city must release the remaining information.¹

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

¹ Because the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released, the city must again seek a decision from this office if it receives a request for the same information from another requestor.

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,

James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/mo

Ref: ID# 978313

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)