



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 12, 2012

Ms. Bertha Bailey Whatley
Chief Legal Counsel and Public Information Designee
Fort Worth Independent School District
100 North University Drive SW, Suite 172
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2012-03640

Dear Ms. Whatley:

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# 447449.

The Fort Worth Independent School District (the "district") received a request for all disciplinary and personnel file information regarding a specified teacher, including termination letters, resignation letters, investigations regarding the teacher, and all documentation regarding allegations of the teacher being intoxicated on district property. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.135 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the district's obligations under the Act. Section 552.301 describes the procedural obligations placed on a governmental body that receives a written request for information it wishes to withhold. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301. Pursuant to section 552.301(b) of the Government Code, the governmental body must request a ruling from this office and state the exceptions to disclosure that apply within ten business days after receiving the request. *See id.* § 552.301(b). While you raised section 552.101 within the ten-business-day time period as required by subsection 552.301(b), you did not raise sections 552.102 and 552.135 within that time. Thus, the district failed to comply with the requirements mandated by subsection 552.301(b) as to its arguments under sections 552.102 and 552.135 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code results in the legal presumption the requested information is public and must be released unless a compelling reason exists to withhold the information from disclosure. Gov't Code § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a compelling reason to withhold information exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Because the district's claims under sections 552.102 and 552.135 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons for non-disclosure under section 552.302, we will address your arguments under those exceptions. We will also consider your timely raised arguments against disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

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 district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on this basis.

Next, you raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (the “ADA”), which provides for the confidentiality of certain medical records of employees and applicants. Specifically, the ADA provides that information about the medical conditions and medical histories of applicants or employees must be (1) collected and maintained on separate forms, (2) kept in separate medical files, and (3) treated as a confidential medical record. 29 C.F.R. § 1630.14(c). In addition, an employer’s medical examination or inquiry into the ability of an employee to perform job-related functions is to be treated as a confidential medical record. *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 641 (1996). The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission determined medical information for the purposes of the ADA includes “specific information about an individual’s disability and related functional limitations, as well as, general statements that an individual has a disability or that an ADA reasonable accommodation has been provided for a particular individual.” *See* Letter from Ellen J. Vargyas, Legal Counsel, EEOC, to Barry Kearney, Associate General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, 3 (Oct. 1, 1997). Federal regulations define “disability” for the purposes of the ADA as “(1) a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of the individual; (2) a record of such an impairment; or (3) being regarded as having such an impairment.” 29 C.F.R. § 1630.2(g). The regulations further provide that physical or mental impairment means: (1) any physiological disorder, or condition, cosmetic disfigurement, or anatomical loss affecting one or more of the following body systems: neurological, musculoskeletal, special sense organs, respiratory (including speech organs), cardiovascular, reproductive, digestive, genito-urinary, hemic and lymphatic, skin, and endocrine; or (2) any mental or psychological disorder, such as mental retardation, organic brain syndrome, emotional or mental illness, and specific learning disabilities. *See id.* § 1630.2(h). Upon review, we find the ADA is applicable to a portion of the submitted information, which we have marked. The district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with the ADA. However, we find the district has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is confidential under the ADA. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses 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 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 some of the documents at issue are medical records, access to which is governed by the MPA. We have marked these medical records, which may only be released in accordance with the MPA.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 21.355 of the Education Code, which provides that “[a] document evaluating the performance of a teacher or administrator is confidential.” Educ. Code § 21.355(a). This office has interpreted section 21.355 to apply to any document that evaluates, as that term is commonly understood, the performance of a teacher or an administrator. *See* Open Records Decision No. 643 (1996). Additionally, a court has concluded that a written reprimand constitutes an evaluation for purposes of section 21.355, as it “reflects the principal’s judgment regarding [a teacher’s] actions, gives corrective direction, and provides for further review.” *North East Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Abbott*, 212 S.W.3d 364 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.). In Open Records Decision No. 643, we concluded that a “teacher” for purposes of section 21.355 means a person who (1) is required to and does in fact hold a certificate or permit required under chapter 21 of the Education Code and (2) is teaching at the time of his or her evaluation. *Id.*

You assert some of the information at issue consists of written evaluations and reprimands that are confidential under section 21.355. We note the submitted information reflects that the teacher at issue held the appropriate certification at the time of the evaluations. Based on your representations and our review, we agree that some of the documents, which we have marked, constitute evaluations as contemplated by section 21.355. Accordingly, the district must withhold the documents we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code. However, you have not demonstrated that any of the remaining information at issue evaluates the performance of a teacher for purposes of section 21.355; thus, none of the remaining information at issue may be withheld on that basis under section 552.101.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law 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 established. *Id.* at 681–82. The type of information considered highly 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. This office has also found 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). We note, however, the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. See Open Records Decision Nos. 542 (1990); 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees); 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees); 432 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Upon review, we find the information we have marked constitutes information that is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate concern to the public. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, none of the remaining information you have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing. Therefore, the district may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Next, you raise section 552.102(a) of the Government Code for some of the remaining information. Section 552.102 excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court recently held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Upon review of the information at issue, we find none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.102 of the Government Code.

We note some remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.¹ Gov’t Code § 552.117(a). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117 must be

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, the district may only withhold information under section 552.117 on behalf of current or former officials or employees who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. To the extent the employee timely elected to keep such information confidential under section 552.024, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code. If the employee did not make a timely election under section 552.024, the district may not withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code.

Section 552.135 of the Government Code provides the following:

- (a) “Informer” means a student or former student or an employee or former employee of a school district who has furnished a report of another person’s or persons’ possible violation of criminal, civil, or regulatory law to the school district or the proper regulatory enforcement authority.
- (b) An informer’s name or information that would substantially reveal the identity of an informer is excepted from [required public disclosure].

Gov’t Code § 552.135. We note the legislature limited the protection of section 552.135 to the identity of a person who reports a possible violation of civil, criminal, or regulatory law. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A). Additionally, individuals who provide information in the course of an investigation, but do not make the initial report are not informants for purposes of section 552.135 of the Government Code. In this instance, some of the information at issue reveals the identity of an individual who reported a possible violation of law to the district. Upon review, we find the district employee who initially reported the allegations to district administrators is the informer. You do not indicate that any of the exceptions in section 552.135(c) apply. *See id.* § 552.135(c) (listing exceptions to section 552.135(b) of the Government Code). Accordingly, the district must withhold the information you have marked, in addition to the information we have marked, under section 552.135 of the Government Code.²

In summary, the medical records we have marked may only be released in accordance with the MPA. The district must withhold the following information under section 552.101 of the Government Code: 1) the information we have marked in conjunction with the ADA; 2) the documents we have marked in conjunction with section 21.355 of the Education Code; and 3) the information we have marked in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the employee timely elected to keep such information confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the district must withhold the information we have

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code. The district must withhold the information you have marked, in addition to the information we have marked, under section 552.135 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, 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 "Kathryn R. Mattingly". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned to the right of the typed name.

Kathryn R. Mattingly
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KRM/dls

Ref: ID# 447449

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)