



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 19, 2022

Ms. Stacie White
Counsel for the City of Boyd
Taylor, Olson, Adkins, Sralla & Elam, L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2022-39446

Dear Ms. White:

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# 991240.

The City of Boyd (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to the requestor's client. You claim some of the submitted information was not properly requested pursuant to section 1701.661 of the Occupations Code. You also claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note you have redacted portions of the submitted information. You state the city has redacted motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code, and social security numbers under section 552.147(b) of the Government Code, and certain information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ However, you do not assert, nor does our review of our records indicate, the city

¹ Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). 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. *See id.* § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous

has been authorized to withhold the remaining redacted information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2000). Because we can discern the nature of the information that has been redacted, being deprived of this information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling in this instance. Nevertheless, be advised that a failure to provide this office with requested information generally deprives us of the ability to determine whether information may be withheld and leaves this office with no alternative other than ordering that the redacted information be released. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body must provide this office with copy of "specific information requested" or representative sample), .302.

As noted above, you state you will redact certain information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code. Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure 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 id.* § 552.130. The city asserts, and we agree, the submitted video recordings contain confidential motor vehicle record information that is excepted from disclosure under section 552.130. In this instance, the city states it does not possess the technological capability to redact information from video files. Thus, we agree the city must withhold the entireties of the submitted video recordings under section 552.130 of the Government Code.² *See* Open Records Decision No. 364 (1983).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by chapter 411 of the Government Code, which makes confidential criminal history record information ("CHRI") generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center. *See id.* § 411.083(a). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI that states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual laws with respect to the CHRI it generates. *See id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI that the Department of Public Safety ("DPS") maintains, except that DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F, or subchapter E-1 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 411.083(a). Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Other entities

determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information or the applicability of section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code to the submitted video recordings. *See generally* Occ. Code § 1701.661(a), (e).

specified in chapter 411 of the Government Code are entitled to obtain CHRI from DPS or another criminal justice agency; however, those entities may not release CHRI except as provided by chapter 411. *See generally id.* §§ 411.090-.127. Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with chapter 411, subchapter F, of the Government Code. We note section 411.083 does not apply to active warrant information or other information relating to one's current involvement with the criminal justice system. *See id.* § 411.081(b) (police department allowed to disclose information pertaining to person's current involvement in the criminal justice system). We find the Federal Bureau of Investigation ("FBI") number consists of CHRI that is confidential under section 411.083. Upon review, we find a portion of the remaining information, which we marked, consists of CHRI that is confidential under section 411.083. Thus, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code. However, we find the city has not demonstrated any portion of the remaining information consists of CHRI for purposes of chapter 411 of the Government Code, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by the Medical Practice Act ("MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. 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.
- (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.

Occ. Code § 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 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).

Upon review, we find a portion of the remaining information, which we 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 information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.107(1). When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a *confidential* communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

The city states some of the remaining information consists of communications involving attorneys for the city, legal staff, and employees in their capacities as clients. The city states these communications were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. The city also states these communications were confidential, and does

not indicate the city has waived the confidentiality of the information at issue. Based on these representations and our review, we find the city has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to some of the information at issue, which we marked. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government 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. 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.). 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 remaining information, which we marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the city has not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city must withhold the entireties of the submitted video recordings under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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,

Pearlie Gault
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PG/pt

Ref: ID# 991240

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)