



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 3, 2013

Sgt. Rocky Bright
Custodian of Records
Ector County Sheriff's Office
P.O. Box 2066
Odessa, Texas 79760

OR2013-11370

Dear Sgt. Bright:

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# 492104.

The Ector County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office") received a request for nine categories of information pertaining to a named decedent. You state you have released some of the responsive information to the requestor. You state the sheriff's office does not maintain records responsive to a portion of the request.¹ You claim some of 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 representative sample of information.²

¹We note the Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request or create responsive information. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 555 at 1 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

²We 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.

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 the Medical Practice Act (the “MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. Occ. Code §§ 151.001-168.202. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in part:

(a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(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(a)-(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). We have also found when a file is created as the result of a hospital stay, all the documents in the file relating to diagnosis and treatment constitute physician-patient communications or “[r]ecords of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that are created or maintained by a physician.” Open Records Decision No. 546 (1990). Section 159.001 of the MPA defines “patient” as a person who consults with or is seen by a physician to receive medical care. *See id.* § 159.001(3). Under this definition, a deceased person cannot be a patient under section 159.002 of the MPA. *See* ORDs 487, 370, 343. Thus, the MPA is applicable only to records related to a person who was alive at the time of diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment to which the records pertain. Upon review, we find some of the submitted information, which we have marked, constitutes medical records subject to the MPA. Accordingly, the sheriff’s office must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. However, we find none of the remaining information constitutes medical records subject to the MPA. Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the constitutional right to privacy. Constitutional privacy protects two kinds of interests. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the "zones of privacy," pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education, that have been recognized by the United States Supreme Court. *See Fadlo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981); ORD 455 at 3-7. The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985); ORD 455 at 6-7. This aspect of constitutional privacy balances the individual's privacy interest against the public's interest in the information. *See* ORD 455 at 7. Constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for "the most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 8 (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492).

This office has applied constitutional privacy to protect certain information related to incarcerated individuals. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 430 (1985), 428 (1985), 185 (1978). This office has held that those individuals who correspond with inmates possess a "first amendment right . . . to maintain communication with [the inmate] free of the threat of public exposure," and that this right would be violated by the release of information that identifies those correspondents, because such a release would discourage correspondence. ORD 185 at 2; *see State v. Ellefson*, 224 S.E.2d 666 (S.C. 1976). The information at issue in Open Records Decision No. 185 was the identities of individuals who had corresponded with inmates. In that decision, our office found that "the public's right to obtain an inmate's correspondence list is not sufficient to overcome the first amendment right of the inmate's correspondents to maintain communication with him free of the threat of public exposure." ORD 185 at 2. Implicit in this holding is the fact that an individual's association with an inmate may be intimate or embarrassing. In Open Records Decision Nos. 428 and 430, our office determined that inmate visitor and mail logs that identify inmates and those who choose to visit or correspond with inmates are protected by constitutional privacy because people who correspond with inmates have a First Amendment right to do so that would be threatened if their names were released. ORDs 430, 428. The right of those individuals to anonymity was found to outweigh the public's interest in this information. ORD 185; *see* ORD 430 (list of inmate visitors protected by constitutional privacy of both inmate and visitors). Although the inmate at issue is deceased and her privacy right lapsed at death, the separate privacy interests of the inmate's visitors in their association with her are protected by constitutional privacy. Accordingly, the sheriff's office must withhold the inmate visitor log we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

In summary, the sheriff's office must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA and the inmate visitor

log we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy. The remaining information must be released.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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Michelle R. Garza
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MRG/som

Ref: ID# 492104

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

³We note this ruling does not affect an individual's right of access to a deceased patient's medical records from the physician who provided treatment under the MPA. See Occ. Code §§ 159.004-.006; cf. *Abbott v. Tex. State Bd. of Pharmacy*, 391 S.W.3d 253 (Tex. App.—Austin 2012, no pet.) (MPA does not provide patient general right of access to his or her medical records from governmental body responding to request for information under Public Information Act).