



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 22, 2005

Ms. Jerris Penrod Mapes
Assistant City Attorney
Killeen Police Department
402 North Second Street
Killeen, Texas 76541-5298

OR2005-11549

Dear Ms. Mapes:

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# 238963.

The City of Killeen (the "city") received a request for information relating to service calls to a specified address on specified dates. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the city's obligations under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.301(e) of the Government Code, within fifteen business days of receiving the request, a governmental body that seeks to withhold information from disclosure is required to submit (1) general written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A). You state that you received the initial request for information on October 3, 2005. Accordingly, the fifteen-business-day deadline to submit the information required by section 552.301(e) was October 25, 2005. However, the city did not submit to this office its comments regarding the claimed exceptions or copies of the requested information until October 26, 2005. Accordingly, we find that you failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 with respect to this information.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released. Information that is presumed public must be released unless a governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold

the information to overcome this presumption. *See Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). A compelling reason exists when third-party interests are at stake or when information is confidential under other law. Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). Section 552.108 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; Open Records Decision Nos. 663 at 5 (1999) (untimely request for decision resulted in waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). *But see* Open Records Decision No. 586 at 2-3 (1991) (claim of another governmental body under statutory predecessor to section 552.108 can provide compelling reason for non-disclosure). Thus, no portion of the submitted information may be withheld on that basis. However, as your claim under section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason for non-disclosure of the remaining submitted information, we will address this exception.

Section 552.101 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 section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides:

(a) A communication between certified emergency medical services personnel or a physician providing medical supervision and a patient that is made in the course of providing emergency medical services to the patient is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(b) Records of the identity, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by emergency medical services personnel or by a physician providing medical supervision that are created by the emergency medical services personnel or physician or maintained by an emergency medical services provider are confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

...

(g) The privilege of confidentiality under this section does not extend to information regarding the presence, nature of injury or illness, age, sex, occupation, and city of residence of a patient who is receiving emergency medical services[.]

Health & Safety Code § 773.091(a), (b), (g). Thus, except for the information specified in section 773.091(g), EMS records are deemed confidential under section 773.091 and, therefore, may only be released in accordance with chapter 773 of the Health and Safety Code. *See* Health & Safety Code §§ 773.091-.094. In this case, we understand you to argue that some of the submitted information is subject to chapter 773 of the Health and Safety Code. However, we find that the information at issue does not consist of communications between certified emergency medical services personnel providing medical supervision and

a patient that is made in the course of providing emergency medical services to the patient. *See* Health & Safety § 773.091(a). Furthermore, the information does not consist of a record of the identity, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by emergency medical services personnel providing medical supervision that were created by the emergency medical services personnel or maintained by an emergency medical services provider. *See* Health & Safety § 773.091(b). Accordingly, section 773.091 does not apply to any portion of the submitted information and the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on this basis.

However, section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information that (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 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. 540 S.W.2d at 683. In addition, this office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy: an individual's criminal history when compiled by a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision No. 565 (*citing United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749 (1989)); 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). Having reviewed the submitted information, we have marked the portions of it that are protected by common-law privacy and must be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis. 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,



Brian J. Rogers
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BJR/krl

Ref: ID# 238963

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Janice Aguilar
916 Mimosa #3
Killeen, Texas 76541
(w/o enclosures)