



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 5, 2012

Mr. Charles H. Weir
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2012-17642

Dear Mr. Weir:

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# 471010 (COSA File No. W009714).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specific case number. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note a portion of the submitted information is not responsive to the request. The requestor seeks only information pertaining to the specific case number. Thus, information not pertaining to the specific case number is not responsive to the request. We have marked the non-responsive information. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request, and the city need not release such information in response to this request.

Next, we must address the city's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedural obligations that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Section 552.301(b) requires that a governmental body ask for a decision from this office and state which exceptions apply to the requested information by the tenth business day after receiving the request. Gov't Code § 552.301(b). In this instance, you state the city received the request for information on August 20, 2012. We note this office does not count the date the request was received or holidays for the purpose of calculating a governmental body's

deadlines under the Act. Accordingly, the city's ten-business-day deadline was September 4, 2012. The envelope in which the city requested a ruling from this office bears a postmark of September 11, 2012. Because the city did not request a ruling from our office within the required time period, we find the city failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301(b).

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the information is public and must be released unless a compelling reason exists to withhold the information from disclosure. *Id.* § 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, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a governmental body may demonstrate a compelling reason to withhold information by showing the information is made confidential by another source of law or affects third party interests. *See* ORD 630. Although you raise section 552.108 of the Government Code for the submitted information, this section is discretionary in nature. Section 552.108 serves only to protect a governmental body's interests, and may be waived. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). Therefore, the city's claim under section 552.108 does not provide a compelling reason for non-disclosure under section 552.302. However, because section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason for non-disclosure, we will consider your argument under that exception. We also note some of the submitted information is subject to sections 552.130, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code, which also provide compelling reasons that overcome the presumption of openness.¹ Thus, we will also consider the applicability of these exceptions to 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 section encompasses information protected by section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides in relevant part:

[T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act], and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

¹The 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).

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). You claim the submitted information pertains to an investigation of alleged abuse or neglect of a child. *See id.* § 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code); *see also id.* § 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of chapter 261). We note, however, the submitted information pertains to an investigation of an assault in which the alleged victim was an adult. Consequently, you have failed to demonstrate the requested report was used or developed in an investigation by the city of alleged child abuse or neglect under chapter 261 of the Family Code. Therefore, the requested report is not confidential under section 261.201 of the Family Code and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. *See Occ. Code* §§ 151.001-168.202. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant 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). 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). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See Occ. Code* §§ 159.002, .004; *Open Records Decision No.* 598 (1991). Medical records must be released on receipt of signed, written consent, provided the consent specifies (1) the information to be covered by the release, (2) reasons or purposes for the release, and (3) the person to whom the information is to be released. *See Occ. Code* §§ 159.004, .005. Any subsequent release of medical records must be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. *See id.*

§ 159.002(c); Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). The submitted information includes the requestor's medical records, which we have marked. Thus, the city must release the marked medical records to the requestor if it receives consent that complies with the MPA. *See* Occ. Code §§ 159.004, .005. If the city does not receive proper consent, it must withhold the marked medical records under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) 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 demonstrated. *See id.* at 681-82. The type of information considered intimate and 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. 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. United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. 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. 455 (1987) (information pertaining to prescription drugs, specific illnesses, operations and procedures, and physical disabilities protected from disclosure), 422 (1984), 343 (1982). Personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is also excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). Upon review, we find portions of the submitted information, which we have marked, are highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note some of the remaining responsive information is subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license, title, or registration issued by an agency of Texas or another state or country is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states, “Notwithstanding 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.” *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see also id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device number for the purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the city must withhold the insurance policy number we have marked under section 552.136.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body,” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See Gov’t Code* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address listed in the information at issue is not specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). As such, this e-mail address, which we have marked, must be withheld under section 552.137, unless the owner of the address has affirmatively consented to its release.² *See id.* § 552.137(b).

In summary, the city must release the marked medical records to the requestor if it receives consent that complies with the MPA. If the city does not receive proper consent, it must withhold the marked medical records under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must also withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.130, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.³

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,

²Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

³We note the remaining information contains a social security number. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person’s social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Gov’t Code § 552.147(b). We further note the information being released contains confidential information to which the requestor has a right of access. *See Gov’t Code* § 552.023(a). If the city receives another request for this particular information from a different requestor, then the city should again seek a decision from this office.

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,



Jasmine D. Wightman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JDW/dls

Ref: ID# 471010

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)