



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 11, 2013

Mr. Christopher Gregg
Attorney for City of South Houston
Gregg & Gregg, P.C.
16055 Space Center Boulevard, Suite 150
Houston, Texas 77062

OR2013-15804

Dear Mr. Gregg:

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# 498978.

The City of South Houston (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for the personnel file of a named individual. You claim 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 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." This section encompasses information other statutes make confidential. You assert the information at issue is protected by the Privacy Act of 1974, section 552a of title 5 of the United States Code ("Federal Privacy Act"). However, the Federal Privacy Act applies only to a federal agency. *See* 5 U.S.C. §§ 552(f), 552a(a). State and local government agencies are not covered by the Federal Privacy Act. *See Davidson v. Georgia*, 622 F. 2d 895, 896 (5th Cir. 1980); *see also* Attorney General Opinion MW-95 (1979). Because the city is not a federal agency, it is not bound by the Federal Privacy Act's confidentiality provisions as would be a federal agency. *See* 5 U.S.C. §§ 552a(a)(1), 552(f) (defining "agency" for purposes of Federal Privacy Act). Therefore, the submitted information cannot be considered confidential by law pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the Federal Privacy Act.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Americans with Disabilities Act (the "ADA"), sections 12101 through 12213 of title 42 of the United States Code. Open Records Decision No. 641 (1996). Title I of the ADA requires that information about the medical conditions and medical histories of applicants or employees be (1) collected and maintained on separate forms, (2) kept in separate medical files, and (3) treated as a confidential medical record. Information obtained in the course of a "fitness for duty examination," conducted to determine whether an employee is still able to perform the essential functions of his or her job, is to be treated as a confidential medical record as well. See 29 C.F.R. § 1630.14(c); see also Open Records Decision No. 641 (1996). The federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (the "EEOC") has determined medical information for 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). Upon review, we find the ADA is applicable to some of the submitted information in Exhibit B. Thus, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the ADA.¹

Access to medical records is governed by the Medical Practice Act (the "MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which is also encompassed by section 552.101 of the Government Code. See Occ. Code §§ 151.001-168.202. 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

¹As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). Upon review, we find none of the remaining information in Exhibit B consists of records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that were created by a physician or someone under the supervision of a physical. Accordingly, none of the information at issue may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code 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 satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82.

Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Additionally, this office has found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (employee's designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 455 at 9 (employment applicant's salary information not private), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow).

Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the marked information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern. Consequently, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note some of the remaining information is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.136 of the Government Code.² Section 552.136 provides, "Notwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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."

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.136 on behalf of a governmental body. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with (1) the ADA and (2) common-law privacy. The city also must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 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.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,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/dls

Ref: ID# 498978

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)