



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 6, 2011

Ms. Amy L. Sims
Assistant City Attorney
City of Lubbock
P.O. Box 2000
Lubbock, Texas 79408-2000

OR2011-14487

Dear Ms. Sims:

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# 432245.

The City of Lubbock (the "city") received a request for all records pertaining to a specified case. 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. This exception encompasses information that other statutes make confidential. You claim the submitted information is protected under the 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. *Id.* § 164.502(a).

This office addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act in Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004). In that decision, we noted 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 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 id.* § 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 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). Because the Privacy Rule does not make information that is subject to disclosure under the Act confidential, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on this basis.

You also claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 181.101 of the Health and Safety Code. Section 181.101 provided “[a] covered entity shall comply with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act and Privacy Standards relating to . . . (3) uses and disclosures of protected health information, including requirements relating to consent[.]” Health & Safety Code § 181.101(3). However, section 181.101 was repealed effective September 1, 2003. Act of June 17, 2001, 77th Leg., R.S., ch. 1511, § 1, sec. 181.101, 2001 Tex. Gen. Laws 5384, 5386, *repealed by* Act of April 10, 2003, 78th Leg., R.S., ch. 3, § 1, 2003 Tex. Gen. Laws 5. Thus, we conclude the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 181.101 of the Health and Safety Code.

Next, you raise the doctrine of common-law privacy, which is also encompassed by section 552.101 of the Government Code. Common-law privacy protects information that (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. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *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. *Id.* at 683. In this instance, you have not provided any arguments explaining, and the

submitted information does not reflect, how any portion of the information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern. Therefore, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the common-law informer's privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). It protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided that the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer's privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." Open Records Decision No. 279 at 2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4-5. However, individuals who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make the initial report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer's privilege. The privilege excepts the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990).

You state the submitted information includes the identity of a person who reported a possible violation of the city's Animal Ordinance to the city's Animal Control Department. You state, and provide documentation showing, a violation of this ordinance would result in a minimum penalty of a Class C misdemeanor and a potential fine to the owner of the animal. However, we note the entity who reported the violation is a business entity and not a person. The informer's privilege does not protect the identity of a corporation that reports a violation of the law, as a corporation is not an individual. *See Roviario v. United States*, 353 U.S. 53, 59 (1957); ORD 515 at 2. Thus, the informer's privilege is not applicable to the information at issue. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the submitted information must be released in its entirety.

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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Jennifer Burnett".

Jennifer Burnett
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JB/dls

Ref: ID# 432245

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)