



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL
GREG ABBOTT

January 23, 2003

Mr. Reed Jackson
Law Office of Reed Jackson
110 South Keech
Fairfield, Texas 75840

OR2003-0474

Dear Mr. Jackson:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 175443.

The City of Fairfield (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information in the personnel files of three police officers. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.102, 552.108, 552.117, and 552.122 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the city's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code. Pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) general written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. You state that the city received the present request for information on October 29, 2002. The city has yet to submit to this office general written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld. Consequently, the city failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301(e) of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See Gov't Code § 552.302; Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.--Austin 1990, no writ)

(governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). You contend that the submitted information is excepted under sections 552.102, 552.108, 552.117, and 552.122 of the Government Code. However, you have not demonstrated a compelling reason for withholding this information under section 552.108 or 552.122. *See* Open Records Decision No. 473 at 2 (1987) (discretionary exceptions under the Public Information Act can be waived); *but see* Open Records Decision No. 586 (1991) (when a governmental body fails to timely seek an attorney general decision under the Public Information Act, the need of another governmental body may provide a compelling reason for withholding the requested information). As sections 552.102 and 552.117 can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address your arguments under those exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 (1976) (confidentiality provisions and exceptions designed to protect the interests of third parties can provide compelling reasons for overcoming presumption of openness).

We note that the submitted information contains a declaration of psychological and emotional health. This declaration is made confidential by section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code, which provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) The commission may not issue a license to a person as an officer or county jailer unless the person is examined by:

(1) a licensed psychologist or by a psychiatrist who declares in writing that the person is in satisfactory psychological and emotional health to serve as the type of officer for which a license is sought[.]

(b) An agency hiring a person for whom a license as an officer or county jailer is sought shall select the examining physician and the examining psychologist or psychiatrist. The agency shall prepare a report of each declaration required by Subsection (a) and shall maintain a copy of the report on file in a format readily accessible to the commission. A declaration is not public information.

Occ. Code § 1701.306. We have marked the information that is confidential under section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code.

Next, we note that a portion of the submitted information is a medical record, access to which is governed by the Medical Practice Act (the "MPA"), chapter 159 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides:

(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. Information that is subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See* Occ. Code §§ 159.002, .004; Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). This office has concluded that 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).

Section 159.002(c) also requires that any subsequent release of medical records be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). Medical records may be released only as provided under the MPA. Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). We have marked the medical record that is subject to the MPA. This information may be released only in accordance with the MPA.

You argue that the submitted documents contain information that is protected from disclosure under section 552.102. Section 552.102 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). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App. Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102 is the same as the test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101 of the act. *See Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 683-85 (Tex. 1976), cert. denied, 430 U.S. 931 (1977).

In *Industrial Foundation*, the Texas Supreme Court stated that information is protected from public disclosure by the common-law right of privacy under section 552.101 when (1) it is highly intimate and embarrassing such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, and (2) there is no legitimate public interest in its disclosure. *Id.* at 685. The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. This office has concluded that common-law privacy protects some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses. *See* Open Records

Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). After reviewing the submitted information, we conclude that the requested information is not protected from public disclosure by common-law privacy. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.102.

Next, you argue that section 552.117 is applicable to some of the submitted information. Section 552.117(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure information that reveals a peace officer's home address, home telephone number, social security number, and whether the officer has family members. "Peace officer" is defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. We have marked the information in the submitted documents that must be withheld pursuant to section 552.117(2). We note here that a peace officer's birth date is not protected under section 552.117, is public information in this matter, and may not be withheld.

We note that the submitted documents contain information that is protected from disclosure under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 provides in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from the requirement of Section 552.021 if the information relates to:

- (1) a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state; [or]
- (2) a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state[.]

We have marked the motor vehicle information that must be withheld under section 552.130.

We also note that you have redacted portions of the submitted personnel file prior to submission to our office. It is important that all information be submitted to our office without redaction so that we can make an accurate determination as to its availability to the public. Failure to submit the information properly is a violation of section 552.301 of the Government Code. In those instances where we can determine the type of information that was redacted, we will rule on the public availability of that information. However, when we cannot determine the substance of the information submitted, it is deemed public under section 552.302 of the Government Code and must be released. We have marked the information accordingly.

To summarize: We have marked the information that may be released only in accordance with the MPA and the psychological declaration that is made confidential by section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code. You must withhold under section 552.117(2) those portions of the records that we have marked that reveal the officers' home address, home telephone number, social security number, and whether the officer has family

members. We have also marked the motor vehicle information that must be withheld under section 552.130. Lastly, we have marked the peace officers' birth dates that must be released, as well as the submitted information that is illegible and deemed public under section 552.302.¹ The city must release the remaining information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or

¹If you believe that the information we have marked for release under section 552.302 is confidential and may not lawfully be released, you must challenge the ruling in court as outlined above.

complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Heather Pendleton Ross
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

HPR/sdk

Ref: ID# 175443

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Ronnie Foster
Foster's Security
P.O. Box 816
Palestine, Texas 75802
(w/o enclosures)