



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 11, 2011

Mr. Hyattye O. Simmons  
General Counsel  
Dallas Area Rapid Transit  
P.O. Box 660163  
Dallas, Texas 75266-0163

OR2011-05017

Dear Mr. Simmons:

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# 414183 (DART ORR #7951).

Dallas Area Rapid Transit ("DART") received a request for information related to a specified accident. You state DART has released some of the responsive information to the requestor. You claim 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. This exception encompasses information other statutes make confidential, such as the Medical Practice Act (the "MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. *See* Occ. Code § 151.001-165.160. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in 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.

*Id.* § 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 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 portions of the submitted information constitute confidential medical records. Thus, the information we have marked may only be released in accordance with the MPA.<sup>1</sup> ORD 598.

You claim the remaining information is excepted from disclosure on the basis of common-law privacy, which is also encompassed by section 552.101 of the Government Code. Common-law privacy 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. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both elements of the test must be established. *See id.* at 681-82. This office has found some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). This office has also found that personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (finding personal financial information to include designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits and optional insurance coverage; choice of particular insurance carrier; direct deposit authorization; and forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care, or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). However, where a transaction is funded in part by a governmental body, the basic facts about that transaction are not private under section 552.101. ORD 600 at 9 (basic facts of group insurance provided by governmental body not protected by common-law privacy).

In addition, this office has found a compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. U. S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the*

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against the disclosure of this information.

*Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (finding significant privacy interest in compilation of individual's criminal history by recognizing distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of criminal history information). Furthermore, a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. Determinations under common-law privacy must be made on a case-by-case basis. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685 (whether matter is of legitimate interest to public can be considered only in context of each particular case); Open Records Decision No. 373 at 4 (1983).

Upon review, we find that some of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Thus, DART must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. We agree some of the remaining information at issue also contains information which may be considered highly intimate or embarrassing. However, because this information pertains to bills submitted to DART for payment, we find there is a legitimate public interest in it. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 545 at 4 (attorney general has found kinds of financial information not excepted from public disclosure by common-law privacy to generally be those regarding receipt of governmental funds or debts owed to governmental entities), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Further, none of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Accordingly, none of the remaining information is confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy, and it may not be withheld on that basis.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. 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. ORD 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 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; *see Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985). After review of the remaining information, we find it does not contain information that is confidential under constitutional privacy; therefore, DART may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code 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.”<sup>2</sup> Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Upon review, we find DART must withhold the account numbers we have marked under section 552.136.

To conclude, the medical records we have marked may only be released in accordance with the MPA. DART must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. DART must withhold the account numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. DART 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,



Tamara Wilcox  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TW/tf

Ref: ID# 414183

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>2</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).