



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 27, 2012

Ms. Amy L. Sims
Assistant City Attorney
City of Lubbock
P.O. Box 2000
Lubbock, Texas 79457

OR2012-02889

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# 448146.

The City of Lubbock (the "city") received a request for a specified incident report from the city's Animal Control Department. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exception 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. Section 552.101 encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. For information to be confidential under section 552.101, the provision of law must explicitly require confidentiality. You assert some of the submitted information is protected under the federal 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. *See id.* § 164.502(a).

This office has addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act. In Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004), 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.” ORD 681 at 8; *see also* Gov’t Code §§ 552.002, .003, .021. Therefore, we 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; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 478 (1987) (as general rule, statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential). Thus, because the Privacy Rule does not make information that is subject to disclosure under the Act confidential, the city may withhold protected health information from the public only if the information is confidential under other law or an exception in subchapter C of the Act applies.

You also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with former section 181.101 of the Health and Safety Code. Former section 181.101 provided, in relevant part, “[a] covered entity shall comply with the [HIPAA] and Privacy Standards relating to . . . uses and disclosures of protected health information, including requirements relating to consent[.]” Health & Safety Code § 181.101(a)(3) (repealed 2003). However, former section 181.101 was repealed effective September 1, 2003. *See* Act of June 17, 2001, 77th Leg., R.S., ch. 1511, § 1, 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 former section 181.101 of the Health and Safety Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law right to privacy, which 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. *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 met. *Id.* at 681-82. Common-law privacy protects the types of information held to be intimate or embarrassing in *Industrial Foundation*. *See id.* at 683 (information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and

injuries to sexual organs). Upon review, we find none of the submitted information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Therefore, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the informer's privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. *E.g.*, *Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935,937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S. W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. *See* Open Records Decision No. 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 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. 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 (1988). 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). We note 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.

You assert the submitted information reveals the identity of a person who reported a possible violation of a city ordinance to the city's Animal Control Department. We understand a violation of this ordinance would result in a civil penalty and potential fine to the owner of the animal. However, we note the submitted information does not identify the individual who reported the alleged violation at issue. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

As you raise no additional exceptions to disclosure, the submitted information must be released to the requestor.

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 that reads "Misty Haberer Barham".

Misty Haberer Barham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MHB/eb

Ref: ID # 448146

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)