



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

May 13, 2004

Ms. Sandra Smith  
Executive Director  
Texas Board of Chiropractic Examiners  
333 Guadalupe, Suite 3-825  
Austin, Texas 78701-3942

OR2004-3921

Dear Ms. Smith:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 201487.

The Texas Board of Chiropractic Examiners (the "board") received a request for all files related to a named chiropractor. You state that the board will provide the requestor with some of the requested information. However, you claim that portions of the requested information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.026, 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, 552.114, 552.130, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim 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." This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 ("FERPA") provides that no federal funds will be made available under any applicable program to an educational agency or institution that releases personally identifiable information (other than directory information) contained in a student's education records to anyone but certain enumerated federal, state, and local officials and institutions, unless otherwise authorized by the student's parent.<sup>1</sup> See 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(b)(1).

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 552.026 of the Government Code provides that "[t]his chapter does not require the release of information contained in education records of an educational agency or institution, except in conformity with [FERPA]." Gov't Code § 552.026. Section 552.114 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure student records at an educational institution funded completely or in part by state revenue. This office generally applies the same analysis under section 552.114 and FERPA. See Open Records Decision No. 539 (1990).

“Education records” means those records that contain information directly related to a student and are maintained by an educational agency or institution or by a person acting for such agency or institution. *Id.* § 1232g(a)(4)(A). The board is not an educational agency or institution.

However, FERPA provides that an educational agency or institution may only transfer personal information to a third party “on the condition that such party will not permit any other party to have access to such information without the written consent of the parents of the student.” *Id.* § 1232g(b)(4)(B). The federal regulations provide that a third party that receives such information from an educational agency may use the information only for the purposes for which the disclosure was made. 34 C.F.R. § 99.33(a)(2). Here, it appears that the board received the transcripts from five educational institutions, The University of Texas at Arlington, East Texas State University, Henderson County Junior College, San Jacinto College, and Texas Chiropractic College. If so, pursuant to sections 1232g(b)(4)(B) and 99.33(a)(2), the board may only release these transcripts upon consent of the named chiropractor. If the board did not receive the transcripts from the five identified educational institutions, then it may not withhold these transcripts under FERPA.

We note that the submitted transcripts contain the chiropractor’s social security number. Section 58.001 of the Occupations Code provides as follows:

The social security number of an applicant for or holder of a license, certificate of registration, or other legal authorization issued by a licensing agency to practice in a specific occupation or profession that is provided to the licensing agency is confidential and not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code.

Occ. Code § 58.001. Accordingly, we find that the licensee’s social security number is confidential under section 58.001 of the Occupations Code and thus must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Next, we note that some of the submitted information constitutes medical records, access to which is governed by the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), chapter 159 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 provides in pertinent 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.

(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(b), (c). 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). Further, information that is subject to the MPA also includes information that was obtained from medical records. *See* Occ. Code § 159.002(a), (b), (c); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). Medical records must be released upon the governmental body's receipt of the patient's signed, written consent, provided that the consent specifies (1) the information to be covered by the release, (2) reasons or purposes for the release, and (3) the person to whom the information is to be released. *See* Occ. Code §§ 159.004, .005. Section 159.002(c) also requires that any subsequent release of medical records be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. *See* Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). Based on our review of the submitted information, we find that portions of this information, which we have marked, are subject to the MPA. Absent the applicability of an MPA access provision, the board must withhold this information pursuant to the MPA.

Also, chapter 201 of the Occupations Code governs the practice of chiropractic. Section 201.402 of the Occupations Code provides in part:

(a) Communications between a chiropractor and a patient relating to or in connection with any professional services provided by a chiropractor to the patient are confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this subchapter.

(b) Records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a chiropractor that are created or maintained by a chiropractor are confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this subchapter.

(c) A person who receives information from the confidential communications or records, excluding a person listed in Section 201.404(a) 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 § 201.402(a)-(c). Chapter 201 includes exceptions to confidentiality and consent provisions. *See id.* §§ 201.403, .404, .405. We have marked the information that is subject to chapter 201 of the Occupations Code. The board may release this information only if chapter 201 of the Occupations Code permits the board to do so.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. We note that you also raise section 552.102, which 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). However, because you do not inform us that any of the information you have submitted to this office is information in a personnel file, we find that none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.102.

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. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The type 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. Additionally, this office has found that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). We have marked the information that must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy.

Additionally, you assert section 552.107(1) of the Government Code, which protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. 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 "for the purpose of facilitating 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 Texas 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 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)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). 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 to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of 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, no writ). 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).

Upon review of your arguments, we conclude that you have failed to demonstrate that any portion of the submitted information consists of confidential communications between an attorney and a client. Consequently, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code prohibits the release of information that relates to a motor vehicle operator’s or driver’s license or permit issued by an agency of this state or a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state. *See Gov’t Code* § 552.130. Accordingly, we agree that the board must withhold the submitted Texas driver’s license information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Finally, section 552.137 of the Government Code provides:

(a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under this chapter.

(b) Confidential information described by this section that relates to a member of the public may be disclosed if the member of the public affirmatively consents to its release.

....

(d) Subsection (a) does not prevent a governmental body from disclosing an e-mail address for any reason to another governmental body or to a federal agency.

Section 552.137 requires a governmental body to withhold certain e-mail addresses of members of the public that are provided for the purpose of communicating electronically

with the governmental body, unless the members of the public with whom the e-mail addresses are associated have affirmatively consented to their release. Section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee's work e-mail address or a business's general e-mail address or web address. We find that the e-mail address you have marked is excepted from disclosure under section 552.137(a). Accordingly, we conclude that, unless consent to release has been granted, the board must withhold this e-mail address pursuant to section 552.137(a) of the Government Code.

In summary, we conclude that, if the board received the transcripts from The University of Texas at Arlington, East Texas State University, Henderson County Junior College, San Jacinto College, and Texas Chiropractic College, the board may only release these transcripts upon consent of the named chiropractor. If the board did not receive the transcripts from the five identified educational institutions, then it may not withhold these transcripts under FERPA. Regardless of the applicability of FERPA, the chiropractor's social security number is confidential under section 58.001 of the Occupations Code and thus must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We also conclude that: 1) absent the applicability of an MPA access provision, the board must withhold the medical records we have marked pursuant to the MPA; 2) we have marked the information the board may only release in accordance with chapter 201 of the Occupations Code; 3) the board must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; and 4) the board must withhold the section 552.130 and 552.137 information. All remaining 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).

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,



W. Montgomery Meitler  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

WMM/krl

Ref: ID# 201487

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. David Rabbani  
Medpro Clinics  
7447 Harwin, Suite 190  
Houston, Texas 77036  
(w/o enclosures)