



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 8, 2005

Mr. Clay T. Grover
Feldman & Rogers, L.L.P.
5718 Westheimer, Suite 1200
Houston, Texas 77057

OR2005-10095

Dear Mr. Grover:

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# 235949.

The Fort Bend Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for any internal audit reports produced by the district since June 23, 2005. The district also received a request for the internal audit report on risk management that was distributed to the board of trustees on August 22, 2005. You state that you have released most of the requested information, but claim that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 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. You claim that some of the submitted information is not subject to release pursuant to the Privacy Rule adopted by the United States Department of Health and Human Services, Office for Civil Rights, to implement the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA").

¹Although you also assert that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.022 of the Government Code, we note that this section is not an exception to public disclosure. Rather, section 552.022 specifies 18 categories of information that must be released to the public, unless the information is expressly confidential under other law. See Gov't Code § 552.022(a).

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* HIPAA, 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 (“Privacy Rule”); *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).

This office has addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act. Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004). In that decision, we noted that section 164.512 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations provides that a covered entity may use or disclose protected health information to the extent that such use or disclosure is required by law and the use or disclosure complies with and is limited to the relevant requirements of such law. *See* 45 C.F.R. § 164.512(a)(1). We further noted that the Act “is a mandate in Texas law that compels Texas governmental bodies to disclose information to the public.” *See* Open Records Decision No. 681 at 8 (2004); *see also* Gov’t Code §§ 552.002, .003, .021. We therefore held that the disclosures under the Act come within section 164.512(a). Consequently, the Privacy Rule does not make information confidential for the purpose of section 552.101 of the Government Code. Open Records Decision No. 681 at 9 (2004); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 478 (1987) (as general rule, statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential). Because the Privacy Rule does not make confidential information that is subject to disclosure under the Act, the district may withhold requested protected health information from the public only if an exception in subchapter C of the Act applies.

You also claim that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), chapter 159 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in 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). Upon review, we conclude that none of the submitted information consists of medical records subject to the MPA. Thus, the district may not withhold any portion of this information under the MPA.

You also claim that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with common law privacy. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of 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). 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. In addition, this office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common law privacy: personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990); 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 identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). We have reviewed the submitted information and find that none of it is highly intimate or embarrassing. Therefore, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common law privacy.

You also claim that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. Section 21.355 provides that, “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential.” This office has interpreted this section to apply to any document that evaluates, as that term is commonly understood, the performance of a teacher or administrator. Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). In that opinion, we concluded that a teacher is someone who is required to hold and does hold a certificate or permit required under chapter 21 of the Education Code and is teaching at the time of his or her evaluation. *Id.* Similarly, we concluded that an administrator is someone who is required to hold and does hold a certificate required under chapter 21 of the Education Code and is administering at the time of his or her evaluation. *Id.* You claim that information you have marked under section 21.355 amounts to an evaluation of a district administrator. You also state that this administrator holds a certificate under chapter 21 of the Education Code. However, after reviewing the information at issue, we find that it only reveals the fact that the administrator in question disobeyed a directive issued by his supervisor. Therefore, we find that this information does not amount to an evaluation of the individual’s performance as an administrator, and it is not protected under section 21.355.

We note that section 552.117 of the Government Code may be applicable to some of the submitted information. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, the district may only withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of current or former officials or employees who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was received. The district may not withhold this information under section 552.117 if a timely election was not made. We have marked the information that must be withheld under section 552.117 if that section is applicable.

In summary, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117 if a timely election was made. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



James A. Person III
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JAP/sdk

Ref: ID# 235949

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Liz Mitton
c/o Clay T. Grover
Feldman & Rogers, L.L.P.
5718 Westheimer, Suite 1200
Houston, Texas 77057
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Seshadri Kumar
c/o Clay T. Grover
Feldman & Rogers, L.L.P.
5718 Westheimer, Suite 1200
Houston, Texas 77057
(w/o enclosures)