



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

January 9, 2008

Mr. John Jordan
Denton, Navarro, Rocha & Bernal
701 East Harrison, Suite 100
Harlingen, Texas 78550-9151

OR2008-00474

Dear Mr. Jordan:

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# 299086.

The City of Pharr (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for any and all e-mails between the requestor and all [city] department heads as well as specified individuals from January 2006 until July 2007. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.136 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.¹

Initially, we note that the city seeks to withhold copies of state statutes under section 552.103 of the Government Code. In Open Records Decision No. 551 (1990), this office considered whether a city ordinance could be withheld from the public under the Act, stating:

It is difficult to conceive of a more open record. The law, binding upon every citizen, is free for publication to all. *Banks v. Manchester*, 128 U.S. 244, 253 (1888). This policy is based on the concept of due process which requires that the people have notice of the law. *Building Officials & Code Admin. v. Code Technology, Inc.*, 628 F.2d 730, 734 (1st Cir. 1980). Given this

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.

constitutional consideration, it is difficult to hypothesize a circumstance that would bring a law or ordinance within an exception to public disclosure.

Likewise, the city may not withhold the state statutes under section 552.103. This information, which we have marked, must be released.

We next note that some of the submitted information constitutes information that is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) enumerates categories of information that are not excepted from required disclosure under the Act unless they are expressly confidential under other law. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.022(a)(1) (stating that a completed report is public information unless excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or made confidential under other law), 552.022(a)(3) (providing for required public disclosure of information in account, voucher, or contract relating to governmental body's receipt or expenditure of public or other funds), and 552.022(a)(8) (policies and procedures). We have marked information that falls within these categories. The marked information is subject to required disclosure under the Act unless other law expressly makes it confidential. Section 552.103 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects the governmental body's interests and is not other law that makes information expressly confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a). *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103). Therefore, you may not withhold any of the information that is subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103. However, you also claim that portions of the information that is subject to section 552.022 are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.136 of the Government Code, which are other law for purposes of section 552.022. Accordingly, we will consider the applicability of these exceptions to the documents that are subject to section 552.022, as well as the remaining information. We will also consider your claim under section 552.103 for the information that is not subject to 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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. You claim that the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 1320d-1320d-8, excepts portions of the information at issue from disclosure. 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. *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* ORD 681 at 8; *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. The Third Court of Appeals has also held that disclosures under the Act come within section 164.512(a). *See Abbott v. Tex. Dep’t of Mental Health & Mental Retardation*, 212 S.W.3d 648, 662 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.). Consequently, the Privacy Rule does not make information confidential for the purpose of section 552.101 of the Government Code. ORD 681 at 9; *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.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if it (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. *See 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 *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court concluded that the identifying information of an alleged victim of sexual harassment is private information. Additionally, this office has found that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). Upon review, we have marked representative samples of the types of information that are confidential under common-law privacy and that the city must withhold under section 552.101 of the Government Code. However, we determine that no portion of the remaining information that is subject to 552.022 constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing information that is of no legitimate concern to the public. Thus, none of that information may be withheld under section 552.101 on this basis.

You also assert that information at issue includes information subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136 states that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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). An access device number is one that may be used to “(1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value; or (2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.” *Id.* § 552.136(a). We have marked a representative sample of the types of account numbers in the information that is subject to 552.022 that the city must withhold under section 552.136.

We now turn to your arguments for the submitted information that is not subject to section 552.022. Section 552.103 provides in relevant part as follows:

(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 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 that 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).

The city asserts that the remaining information is excepted under section 552.103. You state, and provide documentation showing, that Cause No. CL-07-3086-F is pending in County Court at Law No. 6 in Hidalgo County. You also state that the information that is not subject to 552.022 relates to the pending litigation. Upon review, we determine that the city may generally withhold the remaining information pursuant to section 552.103.

We note, however, that the requestor is the opposing party in the pending litigation. The purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties seeking information relating to that litigation to obtain it through discovery procedures. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5. If the opposing party has seen or had access to information relating to pending litigation, through discovery or otherwise, then there is no interest in withholding such information from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, to the extent that the requestor already has seen or had access to the information that is not subject to section 552.022, such information may not be withheld under section 552.103. Otherwise, the city may withhold the information in question at this time under section 552.103. We note that the applicability of section 552.103 ends once the related litigation concludes or is no longer reasonably anticipated. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, the city must release the submitted copies of state statutes. With the exception of the types of information that we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and section 552.136 of the Government Code, the city must release the information that we have marked under section 552.022 of the Government Code. Except for the information that may not be withheld under section 552.103 because the requestor has already seen or had access to it, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.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 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

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

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,



Paige Savoie
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PS/ma

Ref: ID# 299086

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Ruben Luna
c/o Mr. John Jordan
Denton, Navarro, Rocha & Bernal
701 East Harrison, Suite 100
Harlingen, Texas 78550-9151
(w/o enclosures)