



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 18, 2003

Ms. Catherine C. Kemp
Records Supervisor
Rowlett Police Department
P.O. Box 370
Rowlett, Texas 75030-0370

OR2003-5774

Dear Ms. Kemp:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 186160.

The Rowlett Police Department (the "department") received a request for a specified police report. You claim that the requested information or portions of the information may be exempted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with other provision of the law. We have considered your comments and have 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 information made confidential by other statutes. You ask whether any of the submitted information is protected under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA"). At the direction of Congress, the Secretary of Health and Human Services ("HHS") promulgated regulations setting privacy standards for medical records, which HHS issued as the Federal Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information. *See* Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, 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; *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, excepted as provided by parts 160 and 164 of the Code of Federal Regulations. 45 C.F.R. § 164.502(a).

Section 160.103 defines a covered entity as a health plan, a health clearinghouse, or a healthcare provider who transmits any health information in electronic form in connection

with a transaction covered by this subchapter. 45 C.F.R. § 160.103. In this instance, you do not assert or explain that the department qualifies as a covered entity under HIPAA. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that any of the submitted information warrants protection under the federal act, and no information may be withheld on this basis.

Further, you state that some information may be subject to the Medical Practice Act (the "MPA"). The disclosure of medical records is governed by the MPA, as codified at subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. *See* Occ. Code § 151.001. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in relevant part:

(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.

Id. § 159.002(b). This office has concluded that 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). After reviewing the information at issue, we conclude that none of it is subject to the provisions of the MPA.

However, we note that the submitted information contains some private information. Section 552.101 also encompasses the common-law right of privacy. For information to be protected from public disclosure by the common-law right of privacy under section 552.101, the information must meet the criteria set out in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). Common-law privacy 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. 540 S.W.2d at 685. The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. This office has also found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy: some kinds of medical information, or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), and personal financial information pertaining to voluntary financial decisions and financial transactions that do not involve public funds, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992),

545 (1990). We have marked the information that is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Furthermore, section 552.130 excepts from public disclosure information relating to a driver's license or motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state. Gov't Code § 552.130. Thus, the driver's license number and class we have marked is excepted from disclosure under section 552.130.

In summary, the department has discretion to decline to release the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy, and the driver's license information we have marked pursuant to section 552.130. The remaining submitted information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

Ms. Catherine C. Kemp - Page 4

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Kristen Bates
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAB/lmt

Ref: ID# 186160

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Lt. John Incontro
Platoon Leader
Metropolitan Division Mounted Platoon
3934 Rigali Street
Los Angeles, CA 90039
(w/o enclosures)