



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 4, 2008

Ms. Cara Leahy White
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
I-30 at Bryant-Irvin Road
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2008-00155

Dear Ms. White:

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# 298915.

The City of Southlake (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for several categories of information pertaining to a specified address and named individual. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, and 552.117 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 section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. Additionally, pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body must submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *See Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D)*. You inform us that the city received the request in Attachment "A" on October 12, 2007. However, upon review of the submitted documentation, we note that the city received the request in Attachment "A" on September 27, 2007 and a subsequent, similar request from the same requestor on

October 12, 2007. The ten business day deadline for requesting a ruling from this office, calculated from the date of receipt of the original request, would be October 11, 2007. However, you did not request a ruling from this office or submit the information at issue until October 25, 2007. Consequently, we find that the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless a compelling reason exists to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 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). 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). Although you claim section 552.103 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure, section 552.103 is a discretionary exception that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Thus, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, as sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.117 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to withhold information, we will consider whether any of these sections requires the city to withhold 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 Code § 552.101. You assert that a portion of the submitted information is confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with the Medical Practice Act ("MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in pertinent part:

- (a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (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(a), (b), (c). 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). Further, information that is subject to the MPA also includes information that was obtained from medical records. *See* Occ. Code. § 159.002(a), (b), (c); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). The medical records of a deceased patient may only be released on the signed written consent of the decedent's personal representative. *See id.* §§ 159.005(a)(5). The consent in that instance must specify (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. *See id.* §§ 159.004, .005. Any subsequent release of medical records must be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. *See id.* § 159.002(c); Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). We have marked the medical records that the city may only disclose in accordance with the access provisions of the MPA. Absent the applicability of an MPA access provision, the city must withhold these records pursuant to the MPA. *See* ORD 598.

We note that some of the submitted information is subject to the Family Medical Leave Act (the "FMLA"), section 2654 of title 29 of the United States Code, which is also encompassed by section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 825.500 of chapter V of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations identifies the record-keeping requirements for employers that are subject to the FMLA. Subsection (g) of section 825.500 states that

[r]ecords and documents relating to medical certifications, recertifications or medical histories of employees or employees' family members, created for purposes of FMLA, shall be maintained as confidential medical records in separate files/records from the usual personnel files, and if ADA is also applicable, such records shall be maintained in conformance with ADA confidentiality requirements[], except that:

- (1) Supervisors and managers may be informed regarding necessary restrictions on the work or duties of an employee and necessary accommodations;
- (2) First aid and safety personnel may be informed (when appropriate) if the employee's physical or medical condition might require emergency treatment; and
- (3) Government officials investigating compliance with FMLA (or other pertinent law) shall be provided relevant information upon request.

29 C.F.R. § 825.500(g). Some of the submitted documents are confidential under section 825.500 of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Further, we find that none of the release provisions of the FMLA apply to these documents. Thus, we conclude that the city must withhold the documents we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with the FMLA.

The submitted information also includes emergency medical service (“EMS”) records that are subject to chapter 773 of the Health and Safety Code. Access to EMS records is governed by the provisions of section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). Section 773.091 provides in part the following:

(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. . . .

Id. § 773.091(g). We have marked information that is confidential under section 773.091, except as specified by 773.091(g). We note that this information may be released to “any person who bears a written consent of the patient or other persons authorized to act on the patient’s behalf.” *Id.* § 773.092(e)(4). When the patient is deceased, the patient’s personal representative may consent to the release of the patient’s records. *Id.* § 773.093(a); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 632 (1995) (defining “personal representative” for purposes of Health & Safety Code § 773.093). The consent must be in writing, signed by the patient, authorized representative, or personal representative, and specify (1) the information to be covered by the release, (2) the reasons or purposes for the release, and (3) the person to whom the information is to be released. Health & Safety Code § 773.093(a). Thus, the city must withhold the marked EMS information under section 773.091, except as specified by section 773.091(g). However, the city must release the EMS records on receipt of proper consent under section 773.093(a). *See id.* §§ 773.092, .093.

We also note that the submitted information contains W-4 forms. Section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code provides that tax return information is confidential. *See* 26 U.S.C. § 6103(a)(2), (b)(2)(A), (p)(8); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992); Attorney General Op. MW-372 (1981). Accordingly, the city must withhold the W-4 forms we have

marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102(a) is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976).

In *Industrial Foundation*, the Texas Supreme Court stated that information is excepted from disclosure if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Id.* at 685. In addition, this office has found that personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (public employee’s withholding allowance certificate, designation of beneficiary of employee’s retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and employee’s decisions regarding voluntary benefits programs, among others, are protected under common-law privacy). However, the right of privacy is purely personal and lapses upon death. *See Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters. Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref’d n.r.e.); *see also* Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984); H-917 (1976). We therefore conclude that the deceased individual’s privacy right in the information at issue has lapsed, and it may not be withheld this basis. Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.102.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the present and former home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who timely request that such information be kept confidential under section 552.024. Gov’t Code § 552.117. Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989).

You indicate that the employee whose information is at issue made a timely election for confidentiality under section. However, section 552.117(a)(1) deems certain information confidential only in order to protect the privacy of employees. Thus, the home address, home telephone number, social security number and information revealing whether the deceased employee has family members may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. *Cf.* Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) (“the right of privacy lapses upon death”), H-917 (1976) (“We are... of the opinion that the Texas courts would

follow the almost uniform rule of other jurisdictions that the right of privacy lapses upon death.”); Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981) (“the right of privacy is personal and lapses upon death”). Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

We note that some of the remaining information is subject to sections 552.136 and 552.137 of the Government Code.¹ 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(b). The city must withhold the bank account and routing numbers that we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov’t Code §552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address contained in the submitted information is not the type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Therefore, unless the individual whose e-mail address is at issue consented to release of the e-mail address, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, absent the applicability of an MPA access provision, the city must withhold the marked medical records pursuant to the MPA. We have marked the information that is confidential under the FMLA, and must be withheld on this basis under section 552.101 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the marked EMS records under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code, except as specified by section 773.091(g). However, the city must release these EMS records on receipt of proper consent under section 773.093(a). The city must withhold the marked W-4 forms under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. The city must withhold the marked bank account information under section 552.136. Unless the individual whose e-mail address is at issue consented to release of her e-mail address, the city must withhold the marked e-mail in

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

accordance with section 552.137 of the Government Code.² The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.³

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

²We note that the submitted information contains social security numbers. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act. The requestor has a right, however, to his client's social security number. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.023(b) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates, or that person's representative, solely on grounds that information is considered confidential by privacy principles).

³We note that some of the information being released is confidential and not subject to release to the general public. However, the requestor in this instance has a special right of access to the information. Gov't Code § 552.023 (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access to records that contain information relating to the person that are protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests). Because such information may be confidential with respect to the general public, if the city receives another request for this information from an individual other than this requestor, the city should again seek our decision.

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,



Paige Savoie
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PS/ma

Ref: ID# 298915

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jeromie Oney
Durkin Law Offices
669 Airport Freeway, Suite 107
Hurst, Texas 76053
(w/o enclosures)