



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 19, 2016

Mr. Stephen D. Gates  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Midland  
P.O. Box 1152  
Midland, Texas 79702

OR2016-16266

Dear Mr. Gates:

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# 619254 (Midland ID No. 19449).

The City of Midland (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to specified incidents involving the requestor. You state the city has released some of the requested information. You inform us the city will redact certain information pursuant to sections 552.130(c) and 552.147(b) of the Government Code and the previous determination issued to the city in Open Records Letter No. 2015-26022 (2015).<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.1175, and 552.136 of

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). 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. *See id.* § 552.147(b). Open Records Letter No. 2015-26022 is a previous determination issued to the city authority to withhold dates of birth of living individuals under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without requesting a decision from this office.

the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> We have considered the exceptions 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.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information made confidential by statute, such as 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:

(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. 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 a portion of the submitted information, which we have marked, constitutes records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that were created or are maintained by a physician and information obtained from a patient’s medical records. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.<sup>3</sup> However, we find you have not demonstrated any portion of the remaining information you have indicated consists of medical records for

---

<sup>2</sup>Although you claim section 552.117 of the Government Code for portions of the submitted information, section 552.1175 is the proper exception to raise in this instance because the city does not hold the submitted information in an employment capacity.

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not consider your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

purposes of the MPA. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 258.102 of the Occupations Code. Section 258.102 provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

(a) The following information is privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this subchapter:

- (1) a communication between a dentist and a patient that relates to a professional service provided by the dentist; and
- (2) a dental record.

Occ. Code § 258.102(a). A “dental record” means dental information about a patient that is created or maintained by a dentist and relates to the history or treatment of the patient. *See id.* § 258.101(1). Upon review, we find the information we have marked constitutes dental records the city must withhold under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 258.102 of the Occupations Code.<sup>4</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses chapter 411 of the Government Code, which makes confidential criminal history record information (“CHRI”) generated by the National Crime Information Center or by the Texas Crime Information Center. *See Gov’t Code* § 411.083(a). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI that states obtain from the federal government or other states. Open Records Decision No. 565 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual laws with respect to the CHRI it generates. *See id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI that the Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains, except that DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter E-1 or subchapter F of the Government Code. *See Gov’t Code* § 411.083. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Other entities specified in chapter 411 of the Government Code are entitled to obtain CHRI from DPS or another criminal justice agency; however, those entities may not release CHRI except as provided by chapter 411. *See generally id.* §§ 411.090-.127. Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with chapter 411, subchapter E-1 or subchapter F of the Government Code. Upon review, we find a portion of the remaining information, which we have marked, consists of CHRI that is confidential under section 411.083. Thus, the city must withhold the information we

---

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not consider your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law informer's privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. *See Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978)*. The informer's privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." *Open Records Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981)* (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton Rev. Ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988)*. However, individuals who provide information in the course of an investigation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer's privilege. The privilege excepts the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity. *Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990)*. We note the informer's privilege does not apply where the informant's identity is known to the individual who is the subject of the complaint. *See Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978)*.

You state the remaining information identifies complainants who reported violations of law to the city's police department (the "department"). We have no indication the subjects of the complaints know the identities of the informers. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude the city has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to some of the information at issue, which we have marked. Therefore, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.<sup>5</sup> However, you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information consists of the identifying information of an individual who reported a criminal violation to the city for purposes of the informer's privilege. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

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

---

<sup>5</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not consider your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered highly intimate or 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). This office has also found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *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). Additionally, 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. We note records relating to routine traffic violations are not considered criminal history information. *Cf. Gov't Code §411.082(2)(B)* (criminal history record information does not include driving record information). Further, active warrant information or other information relating to an individual's current involvement in the criminal justice system does not constitute criminal history information for the purposes of section 552.101. *See id.* § 411.081(b) (police department allowed to disclose information pertaining to person's current involvement in the criminal justice system).

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 information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern, or the information relates to individuals who have been de-identified and whose privacy is thus protected. Thus, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.1175 of the Government Code protects the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, social security number, and family member information of certain individuals, when that information is held by a governmental body in a non-employment capacity and the individual elects to keep the information confidential. *See id.* § 552.1175. Section 552.1175 applies, in part, to "peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure[.]" *Id.* § 552.1175(a)(1). Some of the remaining information relates to an officer of the department but the information is not held by the city in an employment capacity. Accordingly, to the extent the officer whose information is at issue elects to restrict access to the information you have marked in

accordance with section 552.1175(b), the city must withhold the marked information under section 552.1175 of the Government Code. Conversely, if the officer whose information is at issue does not elect to restrict access to the marked information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the marked information may not be withheld under section 552.1175.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding 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.” *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Accordingly, the city must withhold the routing and bank account numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note the remaining information contains an e-mail address that is subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.<sup>6</sup> Section 552.137 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 id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA, section 258.102 of the Occupations Code, and section 411.083 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the officer whose information is at issue elects to restrict access to the information you have marked in accordance with section 552.1175(b), the city must withhold the marked information under section 552.1175 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. The city must release the remaining information.

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.

---

<sup>6</sup>The 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).

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](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,



Nicholas A. Ybarra  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

NAY/bw

Ref: ID# 619254

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)