



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 14, 2010

Ms. Rebecca Brewer  
Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Joplin, PC  
For the City of Wylie  
P.O. Box 1210  
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2010-18713

Dear Ms. Brewer:

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# 403830.

The City of Wylie (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for a specified police report. 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.

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. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") for the submitted information. 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, excepted as provided by parts 160 and 164 of the Code of Federal Regulations. *Id.* § 164.502(a).

This office has addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act. Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004). In that decision, we noted section 164.512 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations provides a covered entity may use or disclose protected health information to the extent 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 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 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 (2004); *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 not withhold any portion of the submitted information on this basis.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the Medical Practice Act (the “MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which makes medical records confidential. *See* Occ. Code § 159.001. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in part:

- (a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (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.

*Id.* § 159.002(a)-(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). Upon review, we find that you have failed to demonstrate how any of the submitted information constitutes a medical record for purposes of the MPA. Therefore, none of the submitted information is confidential under the MPA, and no portion of it may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on this basis.

You also raise section 552.101 in conjunction with section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code. Section 1701.306 governs the release of L-2 (Declaration of Medical Condition) and L-3 (Declaration of Psychological and Emotional Health) forms and provides in relevant part as follows:

(a) The commission may not issue a license to a person as an officer or county jailer unless the person is examined by:

(1) a licensed psychologist or by a psychiatrist who declares in writing that the person is in satisfactory psychological and emotional health to serve as the type of officer for which a license is sought; and

(2) a licensed physician who declares in writing that the person does not show any trace of drug dependency or illegal drug use after a physical examination, blood test, or other medical test.

(b) An agency hiring a person for whom a license as an officer or county jailer is sought shall select the examining physician and the examining psychologist or psychiatrist. The agency shall prepare a report of each declaration required by Subsection (a) and shall maintain a copy of the report on file in a format readily accessible to the commission. A declaration is not public information.

Occ. Code § 1701.306(a), (b). Upon review, we find the information at issue does not contain any L-2 or L-3 forms. Therefore, section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code is inapplicable, and the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.101 also encompasses section 611.002(a) of the Health and Safety Code, which provides “[c]ommunications between a patient and a professional, and records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient that are created or maintained by a professional, are confidential.” Health & Safety Code § 611.002(a). Section 611.001 defines a “professional” as (1) a person authorized to practice medicine, (2) a person licensed or certified by the state to diagnose, evaluate or treat mental or emotional conditions or disorders, or (3) a person the patient reasonably believes is authorized, licensed, or certified. *See id.* § 611.001(2). Sections 611.004 and 611.0045 provide for access to mental health records only by certain individuals. *See Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990)*. These sections permit disclosure of mental health records to a patient, a person authorized to act on the patient’s behalf, or a person who has the written consent of the patient. *See Health & Safety Code §§ 611.004, .0045*. Upon review, we find none of the submitted information consists of communications or records made confidential by section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code. Therefore, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the common-law right of privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be established. *See id.* at 681-82. The types of information considered intimate or 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. *See id.* at 683. 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, agree that portions of the submitted information, which we have marked, are highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Accordingly, the city must generally withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the remaining information is either not highly intimate or embarrassing or is of legitimate public concern. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy, which protects two kinds of interests. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4, 455 at 3-7. The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the "zones of privacy," pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education, that have been recognized by the United States Supreme Court. *See Fadjo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981); ORD 455 at 3-7. The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985); ORD 455 at 6-7. This aspect of constitutional privacy balances the individual's privacy interest against the public's interest in the information. *See* ORD 455 at 7. Constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for "the most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 8 (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492). Upon review, we find a portion of the remaining information, which we have marked, falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the city must generally withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

We note, however, that the requestor works for the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services. The interagency transfer doctrine provides that information may be transferred between governmental bodies without violating its confidential character on the basis of a recognized need to maintain an unrestricted flow of information between governmental bodies. *See* Attorney General Opinion GA-0055 (2003); Open Records Decision Nos. 680 at 7 (2003), 667 at 3-4 (2000). An interagency transfer of confidential

information is prohibited where a confidentiality statute enumerates specific entities to which release of confidential information is authorized, and the requesting agency is not among the statute's enumerated entities. *See* Attorney General Opinion DM-353 at 4 n.6 (1995); Open Records Decision No. 661 at 3 (1999). Common-law and constitutional privacy are not confidentiality statutes that enumerate specific entities to which release of the confidential information is authorized. Accordingly, pursuant to the interagency exchange doctrine, the city has the discretion to release the information we have marked under common-law and constitutional privacy to the requestor.

In summary, the city has the discretion to release the information we have marked under common-law and constitutional privacy pursuant to the interagency exchange doctrine. If the city does not release the marked information pursuant to the interagency exchange doctrine, then the city must withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the information we have marked under section 552.101 Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy. The city must release the remaining information.

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](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,



Kate Hartfield  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KH/em

Ref: ID# 403830

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)