



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 23, 2008

Ms. Robin King
Custodian of Records
Kaufman County Sheriff's Department
1900 East Highway 175
Kaufman, Texas 75142

OR2008-09995

Dear Ms. King:

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# 316619.

The Kaufman County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff") received a request for three categories of information relating to the termination of a named deputy, specifically (1) the results of drug tests referred to in a letter from the sheriff to the requestor denying the named deputy's appeal, (2) information received from other law enforcement agencies pertaining to an allegation that the named deputy and another employee were possibly abusing drugs, as referred to in the same letter, and (3) the complete internal investigation file on the allegation. You inform us that you will release to the requestor the specified internal affairs file in Exhibit 3. You claim that information responsive to the first and second parts of the request is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.102, 552.103, and 552.108 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 public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision."¹ Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the Medical Practice Act (the "MPA"), chapter 159 of the Occupations Code, which governs access to medical records. Section 159.002 of the Occupations Code provides in pertinent part:

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.101 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

(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). 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).

Medical records must be released upon the governmental body's receipt of the patient's signed, written consent, provided that the consent specifies (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* Occ. Code §§ 159.004, .005. Section 159.002(c) also requires that any subsequent release of medical records be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. *See* Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). Upon review, we find that Exhibit 1 is subject to the MPA. Thus, the sheriff may only disclose Exhibit 1 in accordance with the MPA.²

With regard to Exhibit 2, you raise sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 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.

²As our ruling on Exhibit 1 is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument for this information.

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. *See Thomas v. Cornyn*, 71 S.W.3d 473, 487 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *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 question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” *Id.*

You have failed to demonstrate how the sheriff reasonably anticipated or was involved in pending litigation, at the time the request was received, for the purposes of section 552.103. Accordingly, Exhibit 2 may not be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Next, section 552.108 of the Government Code provides in pertinent part:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

- (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime;
- (2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication;
- (3) it is information relating to a threat against a peace officer or detention officer collected or disseminated under Section 411.048[.]

...

(b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

- (1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution;

(2) the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]

Gov't Code § 552.108(a), (b). A governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information that the governmental body seeks to withhold. *See id.* §§ 552.108, .301(e)(1)(A); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977); Open Records Decision No. 434 at 2-3 (1986). We note, however, that section 552.108 is generally not applicable to records of an administrative investigation that did not result in a criminal investigation or prosecution. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525-26 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108).

In this instance, the requestor seeks certain information referred to in a prior letter sent from the sheriff to the requestor. This letter, which was submitted to this office as an attachment to the requestor's request, states that the information currently at issue resulted in "an administration action and no investigation was opened on either employee based on this information." Based on this statement and our review, we find that Exhibit 2 pertains to an internal administrative investigation. You have not demonstrated that the sheriff's internal investigation resulted in a criminal investigation or prosecution. Although you claim that the information at issue contains the identity of an informer, we note that the "informer" is anonymous and the named individuals are police officers. Because you have not demonstrated how the release of Exhibit 2 would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution for purposes of section 552.108, this information may not be withheld under section 552.108.

We note that Exhibit 3 contains information protected by common-law privacy. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy and excepts from public disclosure private information about an individual if the information (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). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. 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; *see also Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Tex. Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 551 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.). In addition, this office has found that certain medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses is protected by common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (information pertaining to illness from severe emotional and job-related stress protected by common-law privacy), 455 (1987) (information pertaining to prescription drugs, specific illnesses, operations and procedures, and physical disabilities protected from disclosure). However,

information relating to public employees and public employment is generally a matter of legitimate public interest. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in public employee's qualifications, work performance, and circumstances of employee's resignation or termination), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Accordingly, the sheriff must withhold from disclosure the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Next, we note that some of the information in Exhibit 3 is protected by section 552.130 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure information that relates to "a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state[.]" Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(2). Accordingly, the sheriff must withhold the license plate number we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Exhibit 3 also includes credit card numbers that are protected by section 552.136 of the Government Code. 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." *Id.* § 552.136(b). Accordingly, the sheriff must withhold the credit card numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the sheriff may only disclose the information in Exhibit 1 in accordance with the access provisions of the MPA. In Exhibit 3, the sheriff must withhold (1) the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (2) the license plate information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code; and (3) the credit card numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released.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

³We note that the requestor in this instance has a special right of access to some of the information being released. 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). Should the sheriff receive another request for these same records from a person who would not have a special right of access to the private information, the sheriff should resubmit this same information and request another ruling from this office. *See id.* §§ 552.301(a), .302.

such a challenge, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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,



Katherine M. Kroll
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KMK/eeg

Ref: ID# 316619

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Christopher D. Livingston
Lyon, Gorsky, Haring & Gilbert, L.L.P.
3131 McKinney Avenue, Suite 100
Dallas, Texas 75204
(w/o enclosures)