



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

January 4, 2008

Ms. Patricia A. Adams  
Town Attorney  
Town of Trophy Club  
100 Municipal Drive  
Trophy Club, Texas 76262

Mr. Jeffrey L. Moore  
Counsel for the Town of Trophy Club  
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.  
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800  
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2008-00135

Dear Ms. Adams and Mr. Moore:

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# 298765.

The Town of Trophy Club (the "town") received four requests for information pertaining to a grievance filed against the town. You state that the town has released some of the responsive information to the requestors. You also state that the town does not have information responsive to one of the requests.<sup>1</sup> You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.117, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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

---

<sup>1</sup>The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received. See *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ denied); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986).

Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information that other statutes make confidential. You claim that a portion 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”). 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 addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act. *See* 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 disclosures under the Act come within section 164.512(a) of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations. 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*, 212 S.W.3d 648 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no. pet.) (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 town 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.

Next, you assert that a portion of the submitted information is confidential under the Medical Practice Act. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the Medical Practice Act (the “MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 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). 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). We note that the information you assert is subject to the MPA was not created by a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. Thus, we conclude that the town may not withhold this information under the MPA.

You also claim that a portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information 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. *Id.* at 683. In addition, this office has found that the identities of victims of sexual harassment are excepted from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such information). Upon review, we determine that the information at issue is either not intimate or embarrassing or is of a legitimate public interest. Therefore, none of this information may be withheld under the doctrine of common-law privacy.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes 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. *See* 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. *See* 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. *See In re Texas 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 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. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A)-(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. *See 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).

You have marked the information that the town seeks to withhold under section 552.107(1). You state that the marked information consists of attorney-client communications that were made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the town. You also state that the communications were intended to be and remain confidential. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we conclude that the town may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses, telephone numbers, social security numbers, personal cellular 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 of the Government Code. 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 the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). The town may only withhold information under section 552.117 on behalf of current or former employees who made a request for confidentiality prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. For those employees who timely elected to keep their personal information confidential, the town must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The town may not withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1) for those employees who did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential. However, we note, and you acknowledge, that one of the requestors has a special right of access to his own section 552.117(a)(1) information pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(b) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information

relates or person's agent on grounds that information is considered confidential by privacy principles). Accordingly, you may not withhold a requestor's own section 552.117(a) information from him.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code states in part that "[e]xcept as otherwise provided by this section, an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act]," unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. *Id.* § 552.137(a). The types of e-mail addresses listed in section 552.137(c) may not be withheld under this exception. *See id.* § 552.137(c). We have marked e-mail addresses that the town must withhold under section 552.137 unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its disclosure.

In summary, the town may withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.107 of the Government Code. If the current or former town employees timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the town must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.117 of the Government Code; however, the town may not withhold a requestor's own section 552.117 information from him. The town must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released.

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,



Jonathan Miles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JM/jh

Ref: ID# 298765

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Dave Ferman and Mr. Bill Teeter  
Fort Worth Star-Telegram  
400 West 7<sup>th</sup> Street  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Dru Murray  
Fort Worth Star-Telegram  
1103 Keller Parkway  
Keller, Texas 76244  
(w/o enclosures)