



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 29, 2008

Ms. Lois A. Wischkaemper
Senior Vice President and General Counsel
UMC Health System
602 Indiana Avenue
Lubbock, Texas 79415

OR2008-13282

Dear Ms. Wischkaemper:

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# 323127.

The Lubbock County Hospital District (the "district") received two requests from the same requestor for three categories of information pertaining to services rendered by the district to six named individuals. You assert that you have no responsive records regarding three of the individuals. We note that the Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist when the request for information was received. *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex.App.--San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986). 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.

You assert that you have asked the requestor to clarify his request and provide additional information to assist in the search for responsive documents in regards to one of the named individuals. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 31 (1974) (when presented with broad requests for information rather than for specific records, governmental body may advise requestor of types of information available so that request may be properly narrowed). It appears that, as of the date of this letter, the district has not received a response to its request for clarification. Thus, we find that the district has no

obligation at this time to release any information that may be responsive to the request as it pertains to the named individual at issue. However, in the event the district receives a response to its request for clarification, we note that the district will have six business days to comply with the requirements of section 552.301(e) of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 663 at 2-5 (1999) (holding that an appropriate request for clarification under section 552.222(b) merely tolls a governmental body's statutory deadlines under section 552.301 and does not initiate new ten and fifteen business day intervals in which to seek a decision). We will now consider the exceptions you claim for 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. This exception encompasses information that other statutes make confidential. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the federal Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 1320d-1320d-8. 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* Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, 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. *See id.* § 164.502(a). This office has addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act. In Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004), 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 the disclosures under the Act come within section 164.512(a). Consequently, the Privacy Rule does not make information confidential for the purpose of section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Abbott v. Tex. Dep't of Mental Health & Mental Retardation*, 212 S.W.3d 648 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.); ORD 681 at 9; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 478 (1987) (as general rule, statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential). Thus, because the Privacy Rule does not make information that is subject to disclosure under the Act confidential, the district 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 section 241.152 of the Health and Safety Code, which states in relevant part:

- (a) Except as authorized by Section 241.153, a hospital or an agent or employee of a hospital may not disclose health care information about a patient to any person other than the patient or the patient's legally authorized representative without the written authorization of the patient or the patient's legally authorized representative.

Health & Safety Code § 241.152(a). Section 241.151(2) of the Health and Safety Code defines "health care information" as "information recorded in any form or medium that identifies a patient and relates to the history, diagnosis, treatment, or prognosis of a patient." *Id.* § 241.151(2). In this instance, you do not explain how the information at issue relates to the history, diagnosis, treatment, or prognosis of a patient. Thus, we find you have failed to establish that the information at issue is confidential under section 241.152 of the Health and Safety Code.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the common-law right of 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.¹ *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. In addition, 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). Accordingly, the district must withhold the information that we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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

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

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,



Matt Entsminger
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MRE/jb

Ref: ID# 323127

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Clifford Burnett
c/o Ms. Lois A. Wischkaemper
Senior Vice President and General Counsel
UMC Health System
602 Indiana Avenue
Lubbock, Texas 79415
(w/o enclosures)