



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 20, 2022

Ms. Melinda D. Hamm  
Vice President - General Counsel Office  
Midland Memorial Hospital  
400 Rosalind Redfern Grover Parkway  
Midland, Texas 79701

OR2022-39736

Dear Ms. Hamm:

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# 990096.

The Midland County Hospital District d/b/a Midland Memorial Hospital (the "district") received a request for information pertaining to a specified audit. You claim some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. You also claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

The district asserts the information it indicated is not subject to the Act pursuant to section 552.002(d) of the Government Code. The Act applies to "public information," which is defined in section 552.002(a) of the Government Code as "information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business[.]" Gov't Code § 552.002(a). However, "protected health information" as defined by section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code is expressly excluded from the Act's definition of "public information." *See id.* § 552.002(d). Section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code states:

[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[.]

Health & Safety Code § 181.006(1). Section 181.001(b)(2)(A) defines “covered entity,” in part, as any person who:

[F]or 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). The district states it is a hospital and health care provider which we understand maintains health information for the individuals it serves, including information showing individuals received medical care from the district. The district asserts the information collected, used, and stored by the district consists of protected health information. Thus, the district claims it is a covered entity for the purposes of section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code.

In order to determine whether the center is a covered entity for the purposes of section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code, we must address whether the center engages in the practice of collecting, analyzing, using, evaluating, storing or transmitting protected health information. 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 Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act and Privacy Standards [HIPAA].” *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.* Further, “health care” is defined as “care, services, or supplies related to the health of an individual.” *Id.* The information at issue consists of the district’s records that contain individually identifiable health information for purposes of section 160.103 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Thus, the information at issue consists of protected health information for purposes of section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code. Therefore, with respect to this information, the district is a health care entity that is in the practice of collecting, using, and storing protected health information and, consequently, is a covered entity for purposes of section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code. Accordingly, pursuant to section 552.002(d) of the Government Code, we find the information the district indicated consists of “protected health information” not subject to the Act and the district need not release it in response to the present request for information.

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 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 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.*, 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 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 district states Exhibit A consists of communications between attorneys for the district and district employees that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the district. The district states these communications were intended to be, and have remained, confidential. Based on these representations and our review, we find the district has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to Exhibit A. Accordingly, the district may withhold Exhibit A under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). We understand you to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code. 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. This section encompasses common-law privacy, which protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert’s* interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Upon review, we find none of the information at issue is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the district may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

In summary, the information the district indicated consists of “protected health information” not subject to the Act and the district need not release it in response to the present request for information pursuant to section 552.002(d) of the Government Code. The district may withhold Exhibit A under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The district 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,

Kelly McWethy  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KM/jxd

Ref: ID# 990096

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)