



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 13, 2006

Ms. Leslie Lockhart
Adams & Graham, L.L.P.
P.O. Drawer 1429
Harlingen, Texas 78551

OR2006-13419

Dear Ms. Lockhart:

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# 264506.

The Cameron Appraisal District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a named employee of the district and the district's review procedure for expenses. You state that you have provided a portion of the requested information. However, you claim that the remainder of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

First, you raise the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 1320d-1320d-8, for a portions of the Exhibits 5 and 6. 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*

¹We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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, except 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. *Id.*; 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. See *Abbott v. Tex. Dep’t of Mental Health & Mental Retardation*, No. 03-04-00743-CV, 2006 WL 1649003 (Tex. App.—Austin, June 16, 2006, n. p. h.); 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 protected health information from the public only if the information is confidential under other law or an exception in subchapter C of the Act applies.

We note that a portion of Exhibit 5 is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides in relevant part:

[T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

....

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body[.]

Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(3). Exhibit 5 contains invoices and receipts relating to the expenditure of public funds by the district. This information is subject to section 552.022(a)(3) and must be released unless expressly made confidential under other law. You argue that Exhibit 5 should be withheld under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 of the Government Code is a discretionary exception to public disclosure that protects the governmental body’s interests and may be waived. See

id. § 552.007; Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 (1999) (governmental body may waive section 552.103). As such, section 552.103 is not “other law” that makes information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, we will address the applicability of section 552.101 of the Government Code, which is other law for purposes of 552.022.

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 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 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 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 No. 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps); personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600, 545 (1990); details of an employee’s enrollment in optional health and insurance programs, employee’s dependent coverages, and direct deposit authorization, *see* Open Records Decision No. 600 at 9-12; credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information, *see* Open Records Decision No. 523 (1989). However, where a transaction is funded in part by a governmental body, it involves the employee in a transaction with the governmental body, and the basic facts about that transaction are not private under section 552.101. *See* Open Records Decision No. 600 at 9 (basic facts of group insurance provided by governmental body not protected by common-law privacy). We note that Exhibit 6 also contains information that implicates an individual’s privacy rights. Therefore, we have marked the information in Exhibits 5 and 6 that is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Next, we address your argument that the submitted information not subject to section 552.022 is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in pertinent part:

- (a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person’s office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body’s receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). On the other hand, this office has determined that, if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You contend that the submitted information relates to reasonably anticipated litigation involving the employment of the named employee. Upon review of your comments and the submitted information, however, we find that the district has not established that litigation with regard to the named individual’s employment was reasonably anticipated when the district received the present request. Consequently, we conclude the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Next, we address your contention that the information located in Exhibit 4 is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code 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 Tex. 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 a 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). Based on your representations and our review of the information in Exhibit 4, we conclude that the information consists of privileged attorney-client communications and the district may withhold the information under section 552.107 of the Government Code.²

We note that some of the remaining information may be excepted from public disclosure under section 552.117 of the Government Code.³ Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers,

²As our ruling with regard to the information in Exhibit 4 is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). If the employee has timely elected to keep his personal information confidential, pursuant to section 552.117 the district must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibits 5 and 6. However, the district may not withhold this information if the employee has not made a timely election.

Finally, we note that the remaining information in Exhibit 5 includes credit card and bank account numbers. Section 552.136 states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." Gov't Code § 552.136. Accordingly, the district must withhold the credit card and bank account numbers we have marked in Exhibit 5 pursuant to section 552.136.

In summary, the district must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibits 5 and 6 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The district may withhold Exhibit 4 pursuant to section 552.107 of the Government Code. If applicable, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code. Finally, the district must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit 5 under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information subject to the Act 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,



Amy L.S. Shipp
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ALS/sdk

Ref: ID# 264506

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Edwina P. Garza
Valley Morning Star
1310 South Commerce
Harlingen, Texas 78551
(w/o enclosures)