



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 18, 2007

Ms. Amy L. Sims
Assistant City Attorney
City of Lubbock
P. O. Box 2000
Lubbock, Texas 79457

OR2007-16695

Dear Ms. Sims:

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 #297503.

The City of Lubbock (the "city") received a request for all documents "which confirm and/or support Mayor David Miller's claim . . . that the [city] 'has saved more than \$4,000,000 of taxpayers' dollars by changing its Health Benefit Plan over to Blue Cross Blue Shield,'" as well as all documents showing total claims cost for the city's Health Benefit Plan for 2007 to date. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information that is made confidential by statute. You claim that some of the responsive information may not be subject to release

¹Although you initially raised sections 552.107, 552.111, and 552.117 of the Government Code, you have not submitted arguments explaining how these exceptions apply to the submitted information. Therefore, we presume that you have withdrawn these exceptions. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, 552.302.

pursuant to the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (“HIPAA”), 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, 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. *Abbott v. Tex. Dep’t of Mental Health & Mental Retardation*, No. 03-04-00743-CV, 2006 WL 1649003 (Tex. App.—Austin, June 16, 2006, no. pet. h.) (disclosures under the Act fall within section 164.512(a)(1) of the Privacy Rule); 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 city 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.

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 Occupations Code 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). Information that is subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004; Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). 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). The submitted records are computer printouts regarding the city's medical insurance coverage; they are not medical records. Further, you have failed to demonstrate that any of the information contained in these printouts was taken from a medical record. Accordingly, you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of the MPA to the submitted records, and they may not be withheld under this statute.

You also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 181.001 of the Health and Safety Code. Section 181.101 provides that “[a] covered entity shall comply with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act and Privacy Standards relating to . . . (3) uses and disclosures of protected health information, including requirements relating to consent[.]” Health & Safety Code § 181.101(3). However, section 181.101 was repealed effective September 1, 2003. *See* Acts 2001, 77th Leg., R.S., ch. 1511, § 1, 2001 Tex. Gen. Laws 5384, repealed by Act of April 10, 2003, 78th Leg., R.S., ch. 3, 2003 Tex. Sess. Law Serv. 5. We therefore conclude that the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 181.101 of the Health and Safety Code. We now turn to your assertion under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides:

(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.

Id. § 552.103(a), (c). The city 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 is pending or reasonably anticipated, 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). The city must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 552.103(a).

You state, and provide documentation showing, that the city is involved in pending litigation with ICON Benefit Administrators and American Administrative Group. You state conclusively that the information at issue “relate[s] directly to the litigation matters” and that the requested materials “go to the heart of the matters being litigated[.]” You state that the documents show issues involving the health care contract that is the subject of the litigation. However, you do not explain, nor do the documents reflect, what these issues are or what the submitted documents actually reveal regarding the pending litigation. Accordingly, we find that you have failed to demonstrate how the submitted printouts are related to the pending litigation, and none of the information at issue may be withheld under section 552.103. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, the requested 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,



Reg Hargrove
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RJH/eeg

Ref: ID# 297503

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. L. Darlene Mitchell
Attorney at Law
Burt Barr & Associates, L.L.P.
304 South Record
Dallas, Texas 75202
(w/o enclosures)