



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

January 3, 2012

Mr. Ryan S. Henry  
Ms. Jennafer G. Tallant  
Denton, Navarro, Rocha & Bernal  
2517 North Main Avenue  
San Antonio, Texas 78212-4685

OR2012-00076

Dear Mr. Henry and Ms. Tallant:

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# 441206.

The Dallas County Hospital District d/b/a Parkland Health and Hospital System (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for any emails, correspondence, or reports between the district administration/psychiatric staff and a named physician regarding the safety of psychiatric patients that were generated from December 1, 2010 to the date of the request. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup> We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments to this office stating why the information at issue should or should not be released).

Initially, we note that the requestor has specifically excluded any personal information identifying patients from his request. Thus, any of this information within the submitted

---

<sup>1</sup>We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than those submitted to this office.

documents is not responsive to the request. This ruling does not address the public availability of the information that is not responsive to the request, and the district is not required to release this information in response to this request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed).

Next, we note a portion of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information includes completed reports subject to section 552.022(a)(1). Although you raise sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code for this information, these sections are discretionary in nature and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Act of May 30, 2011, 82nd Leg., R.S., S.B. 602, §§ 3-21, 23-26, 28-37 (providing for “confidentiality” of information under specified exceptions); *Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, S.W.3d 69, 475-6 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 663 at 5 (1999) (governmental body may waive section 552.111), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). As such, the district may not withhold the completed reports under section 552.103 or section 552.111. However, section 552.101 of the Government Code protects information made confidential under law. Therefore, we will consider the applicability of section 552.101, as well as section 552.108 to the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1). We will also consider your remaining arguments against disclosure of the information not subject to section 552.022.

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. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 160.007 of the Occupations Code, which provides in part:

(a) Except as otherwise provided by this subtitle, each proceeding or record of a medical peer review committee is confidential, and any communication made to a medical peer review committee is privileged.

Occ. Code § 160.007(a). Medical peer review is defined by the Medical Practice Act (the “MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code to mean “the evaluation of medical

and health care services, including evaluation of the qualifications and professional conduct of professional health care practitioners and of patient care provided by those practitioners.” *Id.* § 151.002(a)(7). A medical peer review committee is “a committee of a health care entity . . . or the medical staff of a health care entity, that operates under written bylaws approved by the policy-making body or the governing board of the health care entity and is authorized to evaluate the quality of medical and health care services[.]” *Id.* § 151.002(a)(8).

Section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code provides in part:

(a) The records and proceedings of a medical committee are confidential and are not subject to court subpoena.

...

(c) Records, information, or reports of a medical committee, medical peer review committee, or compliance officer and records, information, or reports provided by a medical committee, medical peer review committee, or compliance officer to the governing body of a public hospital, hospital district, or hospital authority are not subject to disclosure under [the Act].

...

(f) This section and Subchapter A, Chapter 160, Occupations Code, do not apply to records made or maintained in the regular course of business by a hospital, health maintenance organization, medical organization, university medical center or health science center, hospital district, hospital authority, or extended care facility.

Health & Safety Code § 161.032(a), (c), (f). For purposes of this confidentiality provision, a “‘medical committee’ includes any committee, including a joint committee, of . . . a hospital [or] a medical organization [or] hospital district[.]” *Id.* § 161.031(a). Section 161.0315 provides in relevant part that “[t]he governing body of a hospital, medical organization [or] hospital district . . . may form . . . a medical committee, as defined by section 161.031, to evaluate medical and health care services[.]” *Id.* § 161.0315(a).

The precise scope of the “medical committee” provision has been the subject of a number of judicial decisions. *See, e.g., Memorial Hosp.—The Woodlands v. McCown*, 927 S.W.2d 1 (Tex. 1996); *Barnes v. Whittington*, 751 S.W.2d 493 (Tex. 1988); *Jordan v. Fourth Supreme Judicial Dist.*, 701 S.W.2d 644 (Tex. 1986). These cases establish that “documents generated by the committee in order to conduct open and thorough review” are confidential. This protection extends “to documents that have been prepared by or at the direction of the committee for committee purposes.” *Jordan*, 701 S.W.2d at 647-48. Protection does not extend to documents “gratuitously submitted to a committee” or “created without committee

impetus and purpose.” *Id.* at 648; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 591 (1991) (construing, among other statutes, statutory predecessor to section 161.032). We note section 161.032 does not make confidential “records made or maintained in the regular course of business by a hospital[.]” Health & Safety Code § 161.032(f); *see Memorial Hosp.–The Woodlands*, 927 S.W.2d at 10 (stating that reference to statutory predecessor to section 160.007 in section 161.032 is clear signal that records should be accorded same treatment under both statutes in determining if they were made in ordinary course of business).

You state the district’s board of managers (the “board”) is appointed by the Dallas County Commissioners Court and is charged with the responsibility of managing, controlling, and administering the district. You state the board is required to “establish, support, and oversee a system-wide performance improvement program” according to the district’s bylaws. You further state the board sits and acts as the Medical Review Committee for the district and that one of the board’s responsibilities is “[t]o establish and maintain the process for credentialing, privileging, and evaluating the medical and allied health professional staff.” You inform us that, in furtherance of this duty, the board maintains overall responsibility for the implementation and maintenance of quality assurance and psych-related committees.

You explain the board provides authority to its committees, hospital administrative leaders, and medical staff members to execute the procedures necessary to carry out quality and performance improvement activities. Further, you state the committees, established by the board, ask assigned employees to gather and analyze the information relevant to the adverse event, and then recommend necessary steps to prevent a recurrence. You state the marked information was internally prepared in the course of various committees, including the Psychiatric Improvement Committee, and that the preparation and collection of this information was performed “in a sequence of activity wholly within the purview of duly established medical committees as defined by statute.” Based on your representations and our review, we agree the majority of the submitted information consists of confidential records subject to section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code and section 160.007 of the Occupations Code. However, we find the district has not established pages Quinn 2 0071-Quinn 2 0073 and Quinn 2 00142 - Quinn 2 00144 are confidential records of a medical peer review committee. Therefore, with the exception of pages Quinn 2 0071 - Quinn 2 0073 and Quinn 2 00142 - Quinn 2 00144, the district must withhold the information it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code and section 160.007 of the Occupations Code.<sup>2</sup>

You raise section 552.103 of the Government Code for the remaining information. Section 552.103 provides, in part, as follows:

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body claiming this exception bears the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to demonstrate the applicability of the exception. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party.<sup>3</sup> *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential

---

<sup>3</sup>This office also has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

In this instance, you state the district underwent an audit by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (“CMS”) which revealed several deficiencies. You state the Department of Justice (the “DOJ”) is monitoring the district’s responsiveness to the audit for possible civil and criminal litigation. You state the DOJ has advised the district not to destroy any relevant documents related to the DOJ request as pending decisions for claims are under consideration. However, you have not informed us, nor do the submitted documents indicate, that the DOJ has actually threatened litigation or otherwise taken any concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation. *See* ORD 331. Therefore, we find you have not established the district reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the request for information. Accordingly, the district has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.103 of the Government Code to the remaining information and none of it may be withheld under that exception.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime.” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). Section 552.108 may be invoked by the proper custodian of information relating to a pending investigation or prosecution of criminal conduct. *See* Open Records Decision No. 474 at 4-5 (1987). Where a non-law enforcement agency has custody of information that would otherwise qualify for exception under section 552.108(a)(1) as information relating to the pending case of a law enforcement agency, the custodian of the records may withhold the information if it provides this office with a demonstration that the information relates to the pending case and a representation from the law enforcement agency that it wishes to have the information withheld.

As previously noted, you state that the district received a letter from an Assistant United States Attorney notifying the district that the DOJ is monitoring the district’s responsiveness to the CMS audit for possible civil and criminal litigation. You state the release of the responsive information could interfere with the pending monitoring and potential claims. Upon review, we find the district has failed to establish the information at issue relates to a pending criminal case. Further, the district has not provided our office with any representation from a law enforcement agency indicating that the agency wishes to withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

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 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, lawyer representatives, and a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein. *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 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 a portion of the remaining information consists of confidential communications between the district’s attorneys and the district for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of legal services. You state these communications were between the attorneys and their client and were intended to be confidential, and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the district has demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to pages Quinn 2 0071 - Quinn 2 0073 and, therefore, may withhold this information under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intra-agency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of this privilege is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990). In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, and opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body’s policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (Gov’t Code § 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body’s policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995). Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *See Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); ORD 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

You state the remaining information consists of communications between district employees, including committee members and medical staff, regarding advice, recommendations, and opinions reflecting policymaking processes or matters that affect the district’s policy mission. Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we conclude the district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, the remaining information consists of factual information, or pertains to internal administrative matters that do not rise to the level of policymaking. Therefore, we conclude you have failed to demonstrate this remaining information constitutes internal communications containing advice, recommendations, or opinions reflecting the policymaking processes of the district. Consequently, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of pages Quinn 2 0071 - Quinn 2 0073 and Quinn 2 00142-Quinn 2 00144, the district must withhold the information it has marked under section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code and section 160.007 of the Occupations Code.

The district may withhold pages Quinn 2 0071 - Quinn 2 0073 under section 552.107 of the Government Code and the information we have marked under section 552.111 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michelle R. Garza", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Michelle R. Garza  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MRG/em

Ref: ID# 441206

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)