



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

August 6, 2008

Mr. Marc Allen Connelly  
Deputy General Counsel  
Texas Department of State Health Services  
P.O. Box 149347  
Austin, Texas 78714-9347

OR2008-10715

Dear Mr. Connelly:

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# 318185.

The Texas Department of State Health Services (the "department") received a request for a copy of a specified complaint and the report for Texas Tattoo Emporium records. You state that some of the responsive information will be released to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the department's procedural obligations under the Act. Section 552.301 describes the procedural obligations placed on a governmental body that receives a written request for information that it wishes to withhold. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), the governmental body must ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days after receiving the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a), (b). You state that the department received the original request for information on May 9, 2008. The documents indicate that you sought clarification on May 13, 2008 and received clarification from the requestor on May 20, 2008. *See id.* § 552.222(b) (stating that if information requested is unclear to governmental body or if large amount of information has been requested, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify or narrow request, but may not inquire into purpose for which information will be used); Open Records Decision No. 663 at 5 (1999) (ten business-day deadline tolled while governmental body awaits clarification). Thus your deadline to ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply was June 2, 2008. However, you did not request a ruling from our office until June 3, 2008. Consequently, we find that the department failed

to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 in requesting this decision from our office.

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 the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); 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). Because your claim under section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason for non-disclosure, we will consider your arguments under this exception.

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. Section 552.101 encompasses information made confidential by 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). We have marked the medical records that are confidential under the MPA. This information may only be released in accordance with the MPA. *See* ORD 598. You have failed to demonstrate how the remaining records were either created by or under the supervision of a physician or contain the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician. Thus, the remaining records do not constitute medical records for purposes of the MPA, and they may not be withheld on this basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrines of common-law and constitutional 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 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. Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld.

Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently; and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4. The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected under constitutional privacy is narrower than that under the common-law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)).

We have considered your arguments and reviewed the remaining information at issue. We find that none of the remaining information constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing information in which there is no legitimate public interest. Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. We further conclude that you have not shown that any of this information comes within one of the constitutional zones of privacy or involves the most intimate aspects of human affairs. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470, 455, 444 (1986), 423 at 2 (1984). Therefore, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of constitutional privacy.

In summary, absent the applicability of an MPA access provision, the department must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to the MPA. The remaining 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). 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,



Benjamin A. Diener  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BAD/jb

Ref: ID# 318185

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Andrew Krupka  
Texas Tattoo Emporium, Inc.  
13664 B Westheimer  
Houston, Texas 77077  
(w/o enclosures)