ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 2, 2014

Ms. Donna L. Clarke
Assistant Criminal District Attorney
Lubbock County Criminal District Attorney's Office
P.O. Box 10536
Lubbock, Texas 79408-3536

OR2014-11427

Dear Ms. Clarke:

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# 527883.

The Lubbock County Medical Examiner's Office (the "medical examiner's office") received a request for information pertaining to the death of a named individual. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.[1] We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note the requestor asserts a right of access to the submitted information under federal law. In this instance, the requestor is a representative of Disability Rights Texas ("DRTX"), formerly known as Advocacy, Inc., which has been designated as the state's

[1]We 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 that submitted to this office.

protection and advocacy system ("P&A system") for purposes of the federal Protection and Advocacy for Individuals with Mental Illness Act ("PAIMI Act"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 10801-10851, the Developmental Disabilities Assistance and Bill of Rights Act ("DDA Act"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 15041-15045, and the Protection and Advocacy of Individual Rights Act ("PAIR Act"), 29 U.S.C. § 794e. *See* Tex. Gov. Exec. Order No. DB-33, 2 Tex. Reg. 3713 (1977); Attorney General Opinion JC-0461 (2002); *see also* 42 C.F.R. §§ 51.2 (defining "designated official" and requiring official to designate agency to be accountable for funds of P&A agency), .22 (requiring P&A agency to have a governing authority responsible for control).

The PAIMI provides, in relevant part, DRTX, as the state's P&A system, shall

> (1) have the authority to–
>
> > (A) investigate incidents of abuse and neglect of individuals with mental illness if the incidents are reported to the [P&A] system or if there is probable cause to believe that the incidents occurred[.]

42 U.S.C. § 10805(a)(1)(A). Further, the PAIMI provides DRTX shall

> (4) . . . have access to all records of –
>
> > (B) any individual (including an individual who has died or whose whereabouts are unknown)-
> >
> > > (i) who by reason of the mental or physical condition of such individual is unable to authorize the [P&A] system to have such access;
> > >
> > > (ii) who does not have a legal guardian, conservator, or other legal representative, or for whom the legal guardian is the State; and
> > >
> > > (iii) with respect to whom a complaint has been received by the [P&A] system or with respect to whom as a result of monitoring or other activities (either of which result from a complaint or other evidence) there is probable cause to believe that such individual has been subject to abuse or neglect[.]

Id. § 10805(a)(4)(B). The term "records" as used in the above-quoted provision

> includes reports prepared by any staff of a facility rendering care and treatment [to the individual] or reports prepared by an agency charged with investigating reports of incidents of abuse, neglect, and injury occurring at such facility that describe incidents of abuse, neglect, and injury occurring at such facility and the steps taken to investigate such incidents, and discharge planning records.

Id. § 10806(b)(3)(A); *see also* 42 C.F.R. § 51.41(c) (addressing P&A system's access to records under PAIMI). Further, PAIMI defines the term "facilities" and states the term "may include, but need not be limited to, hospitals, nursing homes, community facilities for individuals with mental illness, board and care homes, homeless shelters, and jails and prisons." 42 U.S.C. § 10802(3). The DDA Act provides, in relevant part, that a P&A system shall

> (B) have the authority to investigate incidents of abuse and neglect of individuals with developmental disabilities if the incidents are reported to the system or if there is probable cause to believe that the incidents occurred;
>
> . . .
>
> (I) have access to all records of–
>
> > (ii) any individual with a developmental disability, in a situation in which-
> >
> > > (I) the individual, by reason of such individual's mental or physical condition, is unable to authorize the system to have such access;
> > >
> > > (II) the individual does not have a legal guardian, conservator, or other legal representative, or the legal guardian of the individual is the State; and
> > >
> > > (III) a complaint has been received by the system about the individual with regard to the status or treatment of the individual or, as a result of monitoring or other activities, there is probable cause to believe that such individual has been subject to abuse or neglect[.]
>
> . . .

> (J)(I) have access to the records of individuals described in subparagraphs (B) and (I), and other records that are relevant to conducting an investigation, under the circumstances described in those subparagraphs, not later than 3 business days after the [P&A] system makes a written request for the records involved[.]

Id. § 15043(a)(2)(B), (I)(ii), (J)(i). The DDA Act states the term "record" includes

> (1) a report prepared or received by any staff at any location at which services, supports, or other assistance is provided to individuals with developmental disabilities;
>
> (2) a report prepared by an agency or staff person charged with investigating reports of incidents of abuse or neglect, injury, or death occurring at such location, that describes such incidents and the steps taken to investigate such incidents; and
>
> (3) a discharge planning record.

Id. § 15043(c). The PAIR Act provides, in relevant part, a P&A system will "have the same . . . access to records and program income, as are set forth in [the DDA Act]." 29 U.S.C. § 794e(f)(2).

The requestor states the deceased individual suffered from a disability and DRTX received a report regarding the death of this individual while he was in the care and custody of Hockley County Jail. DRTX asserts it is investigating the individual's death and has probable cause to believe it may have been the result of abuse and neglect. *See* 42 C.F.R. § 51.2 (stating that the probable cause decision under PAIMI may be based on reasonable inference drawn from one's experience or training regarding similar incidents, conditions or problems that are usually associated with abuse or neglect).

We note a state statute is preempted by federal law to the extent it conflicts with that federal law. *See, e.g.*, *Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n v. City of Orange*, 905 F. Supp. 381, 382 (E.D. Tex. 1995). Further, federal regulations provide that state law must not diminish the required authority of a P&A system. *See* 45 C.F.R. § 1386.21(f); *see also Iowa Prot. & Advocacy Servs., Inc. v. Gerard*, 274 F. Supp. 2d 1063 (N.D. Iowa 2003) (broad right of access under section 15043 of title 42 of the United States Code applies despite existence of any state or local laws or regulations which attempt to restrict access; although state law may expand authority of P&A system, state law cannot diminish authority set forth in federal statutes); *Iowa Prot. & Advocacy Servs., Inc. v. Rasmussen*, 206 F.R.D. 630, 639 (S.D. Iowa 2001); *cf.* 42 U.S.C. § 10806(b)(2)(C). Similarly, Texas law states, "[n]otwithstanding other state law, [a P&A system] . . . is entitled to access to records

relating to persons with mental illness to the extent authorized by federal law." Health & Safety Code § 615.002(a). Thus, the PAIMI Act and the DDA Act grant DRTX access to "records," and, to the extent state law provides for the confidentiality of "records" requested by DRTX, its federal rights of access under the PAIMI Act and the DDA Act preempt state law. *See* 42 C.F.R. § 51.41(c); *see also Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n*, 905 F. Supp. at 382. Accordingly, we must address whether the information at issue constitutes "records" of an individual with a mental illness as defined by the PAIMI Act or a disability as defined by the DDA Act.

Although the definition of "records" is not limited to the information specifically described in sections 10806(b)(3)(A) and 15043(c) of title 42 of the United States Code, we do not believe Congress intended for the definitions to be so expansive as to grant a P&A system access to any information it deems necessary.[2] Such a reading of the statute would render sections 10806(b)(3)(A) and 15043(c) insignificant. *See Duncan v. Walker*, 533 U.S. 167, 174 (2001) (statute should be construed in a way that no clause, sentence, or word shall be superfluous, void, or insignificant). Furthermore, in light of Congress's evident preference for limiting the scope of access, we are unwilling to assume that Congress meant more than it said in enacting the PAIMI Act and the DDA Act. *See Kofa v. INS*, 60 F.3d 1084 (4th Cir. 1995) (stating that statutory construction must begin with language of statute; to do otherwise would assume that Congress does not express its intent in words of statutes, but only by way of legislative history). *See generally Coast Alliance v. Babbitt*, 6 F. Supp. 2d 29 (D.D.C. 1998) (stating that if, in following Congress's plain language in statute, agency cannot carry out Congress's intent, remedy is not to distort or ignore Congress's words, but rather to ask Congress to address problem). Based on this analysis, we believe the information specifically described in sections 10806(b)(3)(A) and 15043(c) is indicative of the types of information to which Congress intended to grant a P&A system access. *See Penn. Prot. & Advocacy, Inc. v. Houstoun*, 228 F.3d 423, 426 n.1 (3rd Cir. 2000) ("[I]t is clear that the definition of 'records' in § 10806 controls the types of records to which [the P&A system] 'shall have access' under § 10805[.]").

In this instance, the submitted information consists of an autopsy report and related records which pertain to the named individual and his death and were assembled or prepared by the medical examiner's office. The medical examiner's office does not itself provide care, treatment, services, support, or other assistance to individuals with developmental disabilities, and DRTX does not explain whether the medical examiner's office provides its reports to a facility that provides care, treatment, services, support, or other assistance to developmentally disabled individuals. *See* 42 U.S.C. §§ 10806(b)(3)(A), 15043(c)(1). DRTX has not demonstrated the medical examiner's office is charged with investigating

---

[2]Use of the term "includes" in section 10806(b)(3)(A) of title 42 of the United States Code indicates the definition of "records" is not limited to the information specifically listed in that section. *See St. Paul Mercury Ins. Co. v. Lexington Ins. Co.*, 78 F.3d 202 (5th Cir. 1996); *see also* 42 C.F.R. § 51.41.

reports of abuse, neglect, injury, or death occurring at such a facility, nor how the submitted information was created for this purpose. *See id.* §§ 10806(b)(3)(A), 15043(c)(2). The submitted records are not discharge planning records. *See id.* § 15043(c)(3). Thus, we conclude DRTX has failed to demonstrate the submitted information is among the information specifically listed as a "record" in the PAIMI or the DDA. Furthermore, we find this information is not the type of information to which Congress intended to grant a P&A system access. Accordingly, we find DRTX does not have a right of access to the submitted information under either the PAIMI or the DDA Act.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]" Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body must reasonably explain how and why section 552.108 is applicable to the information at issue. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). Section 552.108 applies to information held by a "law enforcement agency." However, section 552.108 may be invoked by the proper custodian of information relating to a pending investigation or prosecution of criminal conduct. *See* Open Records Decision No. 474 at 4-5 (1987). Where a non-law enforcement agency has custody of information that would otherwise qualify for exception under section 552.108 as information relating to the pending case of a law enforcement agency, the custodian of the records may withhold the information if it provides this office with a demonstration the information relates to the pending case and a representation from the law enforcement agency that it wishes to have the information withheld.

You inform us the Hockley County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") objects to disclosure of the submitted information because its release would interfere with an ongoing criminal investigation. Based on your representation, we conclude the medical examiner's office may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976).

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,

David L. Wheelus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DLW/bhf

Ref: ID# 527883

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)