



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 14, 2010

Mr. Ronald J. Bounds
Assistant City Attorney
City of Corpus Christi
P.O. Box 9277
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469-9277

OR2010-13929

Dear Mr. Bounds:

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# 393262.

The City of Corpus Christi (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to delinquent accounts. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 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, such as section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides in relevant part:

(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.

Health & Safety Code § 773.091(b), (g). Except for the information specified in section 773.091(g), EMS records are deemed confidential under section 773.091 and may only be released in accordance with chapter 773 of the Health and Safety Code. *See id.* §§ 773.091-.094. You state the information at issue is maintained by the city's fire department and reveals the identity of patients treated by EMS personnel. Based on your representation and our review, we agree the submitted information constitutes EMS records that are subject to chapter 773 of the Health and Safety Code. As you acknowledge, however, records that are confidential under section 773.091 may be disclosed to "any person who bears a written consent of the patient or other persons authorized to act on the patient's behalf for the release of confidential information." *Id.* §§ 773.092(e)(4), .093. Section 773.093 provides a consent for release of EMS records must specify (1) the information or records to be covered by the release; (2) the reasons or purpose for the release; and (3) the person to whom the information is to be released. In this instance, you state the requestor "has not submitted adequate written consent of the patient or another person authorized to act on the patient's behalf." Thus, with the exception of the information subject to section 773.091(g), which is not confidential, the submitted EMS records may only be released if the city receives proper written consent in accordance with chapter 773 of the Health and Safety Code. *See id.* §§ 773.091-.093.

You claim the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. *See Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002)*. First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. *See TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)*. The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *See In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App. -Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. *See TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A)-(E)*. Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was "not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition

of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *See Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.–Waco 1997, no pet.). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You state the information you have marked constitutes attorney-client communications. You have identified the parties to the communications. You state the communications were intended to be confidential, and you indicate that the communications have maintained their confidentiality. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude that the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of the information subject to section 773.091(g) the submitted EMS records may only be released if the city receives proper written consent in accordance with chapter 773 of the Health and Safety Code. The city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107. As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Chris Schulz
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CS/em

Mr. Ronald J. Bounds - Page 4

Ref: ID# 393262

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)