



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 23, 2016

Ms. Charla Thomas  
Deputy City Attorney  
City of Temple  
2 North Main Street, Suite 308  
Temple, Texas 76501

OR2016-21580

Dear Ms. Thomas:

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# 627621.

The City of Temple (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. 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." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information made confidential by statute, such as section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides the following:

[F]or a covered entity that is a governmental unit, an individual's protected health information:

- (1) includes any information that reflects that an individual received health care from the covered entity; and
- (2) is not public information and is not subject to disclosure under [the Act].

Health & Safety Code § 181.006. Section 181.001(b)(2)(A) defines “covered entity” to include any person who:

(A) for commercial, financial, or professional gain, monetary fees, or dues, or on a cooperative, nonprofit, or pro bono basis, engages, in whole or in part, and with real or constructive knowledge, in the practice of assembling, collecting, analyzing, using, evaluating, storing, or transmitting protected health information. The term includes a business associate, health care payer, governmental unit, information or computer management entity, school, health researcher, health care facility, clinic, health care provider, or person who maintains an Internet site[.]

*Id.* § 181.001(b)(2)(A). The city does not inform us it is a covered entity for purposes of section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code. Therefore, we find the city has failed to demonstrate any of the submitted information is subject to section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code, and thus, the city may not withhold any information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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. 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.

Occ. Code § 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 the information we have marked constitutes a record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a

patient by a physician that was created or is maintained by a physician. Accordingly, the city must withhold the marked medical record under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.<sup>1</sup> However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information consists of a physician-patient communication or a record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that was created or is maintained by a physician. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides in part:

(a) A communication between certified emergency medical services [(“EMS”)] personnel or a physician providing medical supervision and a patient that is made in the course of providing emergency medical services to the patient is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(b) Records of the identity, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by emergency medical services personnel or by a physician providing medical supervision that are created by the emergency medical services personnel or physician or maintained by an emergency medical services provider are confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

...

(g) The privilege of confidentiality under this section does not extend to information regarding the presence, nature of injury or illness, age, sex, occupation, and city of residence of a patient who is receiving emergency medical services.

Health & Safety Code § 773.091(a)-(b), (g). The information in Exhibit C consists of records made and maintained by EMS personnel. Upon review, we find section 773.091 is applicable to the information at issue. Thus, with the exception of the information subject to section 773.091(g), which is not confidential and must be released, the city must withhold the information in Exhibit C under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091(b) of the Health and Safety Code.

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

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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. This office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). In considering whether a public citizen's date of birth is private, the Third Court of Appeals looked to the supreme court's rationale in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of Texas*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). The supreme court concluded public employees' dates of birth are private under section 552.102 of the Government Code because the employees' privacy interest substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in disclosure.<sup>2</sup> *Texas Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Texas Comptroller*, the court of appeals concluded the privacy rights of public employees apply equally to public citizens, and thus, public citizens' dates of birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3.

Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, where it is demonstrated the requestor knows the identity of the individual involved as well as the nature of certain incidents, the entire report must be withheld to protect the individual's privacy. The city seeks to withhold the entirety of Exhibit B under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the city has not demonstrated, nor does it otherwise appear, this is a situation in which the entirety of the information at issue must be withheld on the basis of common-law privacy. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the entirety of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis. Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Thus, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

---

<sup>2</sup>Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a).

Some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.1175 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> Section 552.1175 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* Gov't Code § 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). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.1175 if the individual to whom this information pertains is a currently licensed peace officer and elects to restrict access to his information in accordance with section 552.1175(b) of the Government Code. However, the city may not withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.1175 if the individual is not a currently licensed peace officer, or no election is made.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or a personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *Id.* § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the city must withhold any discernible audible or visible motor vehicle record information in the submitted video recordings under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the marked medical record under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. With the exception of the information subject to section 773.091(g), the city must withhold the information in Exhibit C under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091(b) of the Health and Safety Code. The city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.1175 if the individual to whom this information pertains is a currently licensed peace officer and elects to restrict access to his information in accordance with section 552.1175(b) of the Government Code. The city must withhold any discernible audible or visible motor vehicle record information in the submitted video recordings under section 552.130 of the Government Code. 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>3</sup>The 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).

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,



Cristian Rosas-Grillet  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CRG/bw

Ref: ID# 627621

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)