



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 16, 2006

Ms. Yushan Chang
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2006-02630

Dear Ms. Chang:

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# 244116.

The Houston Police Department (the "department") received a request for "any and all correspondence that was originated by the Police Academy Division, the City of Houston's Health Department's Director, and any other department that was involved in the decision to recommend [the requestor's] termination[.]" You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we address your obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code. This section prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office

¹Although you also raise sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.108, 552.130 and 552.147 of the Government Code, you have not provided any arguments in support of these claims. Thus, the department has waived its claims under sections 552.103 and 552.108. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions in general). Further, the department has not demonstrated that any of the submitted information is confidential for purposes of sections 552.101, 552.130 or 552.147. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, 302.

to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Section 552.301(b) requires the governmental body to ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions to disclosure not later than the tenth business day after the date of its receipt of the written request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). You state that the department received the present request on December 20, 2005. However, you did not raise section 552.107 until January 12, 2006. Therefore, the department failed to raise section 552.107 within the ten-business-day deadline prescribed by section 552.301(b).

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *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 section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Normally, a compelling reason for non-disclosure exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Section 552.107 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 630 at 4 (1994) (governmental body may waive attorney-client privilege, section 552.107(1)). In failing to comply with section 552.301, the department has waived its claim under section 552.107. Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.107.

We note that the submitted information contains a medical record. 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. Section 552.101 encompasses the Medical Privacy Act ("MPA"), chapter 159 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides:

(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). The medical records must be released upon 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. 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. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). Medical records may be released only as provided under the MPA. Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). We have marked the document which is a medical record subject to the MPA. The requestor is the individual to whom the marked information pertains, and thus the requestor may have a right of access to that information. The information that is subject to the MPA may be released only if the MPA permits the department to do so.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. See *Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990). In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined that section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 5. A governmental body’s policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; see also *City of Garland v. The Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (Gov’t Code § 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body’s policy mission. See Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995).

You seek to withhold the information submitted as Exhibit 3 under section 552.111. We find, however, that this information addresses a specific personnel matter. You have not demonstrated that this information rises to the level of a policymaking issue of the department. Thus, we conclude that the department may not withhold any of the information in Exhibit 3 under section 552.111.

In summary, the medical record we have marked may only be released to the requestor in accordance with the provisions of the MPA. The remaining submitted information must be released.²

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).

²We note that the remaining documents contain confidential information belonging to the requestor, which is normally excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the doctrine of common law privacy. However, the requestor has a special right of access to her own information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(b) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates on grounds that information is considered confidential by privacy principles). If the department receives a future request for this information from an individual other than the requestor or her agent, the department should again seek our decision.

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,



Matthew T. McLain
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MM/jh

Ref: ID# 244116

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Tracy N. Perales
4703 River Tree Lane
Spring, Texas 77388
(w/o enclosures)