



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 24, 2004

Ms. Sandra Smith
Executive Director
Texas Board of Chiropractic Examiners
333 Guadalupe, Suite 3-825
Austin, Texas 78701-3942

OR2004-4208

Dear Ms. Smith:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 202136.

The Texas Board of Chiropractic Examiners (the "board") received a request for all files related to a named chiropractor. You state that the board is releasing some responsive information. You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.026, 552.101, 552.102, 552.107, 552.108, 552.114, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

You claim that the information submitted as Exhibit A must be withheld under sections 552.026 and 552.114 of the Government Code as well as pursuant to The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 ("FERPA"). 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 protected by other statutes. FERPA provides that no federal funds will be made available under any applicable program to an educational agency or institution that releases personally identifiable information (other than directory information) contained in a student's education records to anyone but certain enumerated federal, state, and local officials and institutions, unless otherwise authorized by the student's parent. *See* 20 U.S.C. § 1232g(b)(1). "Education records" means those records that contain information directly related to a student and are maintained by an educational agency or institution or by a person acting for such agency or institution. *Id.* § 1232g(a)(4)(A). The board is not an educational agency or institution.

However, FERPA provides that an educational agency or institution may only transfer personal information to a third party "on the condition that such party will not permit any other party to have access to such information without the written consent of the parents of the student." *Id.* § 1232g(b)(4)(B). The federal regulations provide that a third party that receives such information from an educational agency may use the information only for the purposes for which the disclosure was made. 34 C.F.R. § 99.33(a)(2). Here, it appears that the board received one of the transcripts from an educational institution, San Jacinto College. If so, pursuant to sections 1232g(b)(4)(B) and 99.33(a)(2), the board may only release this transcript upon consent of the named chiropractor. If the board did not receive the transcript from the college, then it may not withhold this transcript under FERPA. Likewise, it does not appear that the board received the remaining transcripts from McLennan Community College, the University of Missouri, or the Texas Chiropractic College. Thus, the board may not withhold the remaining transcripts under FERPA.

The transcripts contain the chiropractor's social security number. Section 58.001 of the Occupations Code provides as follows:

The social security number of an applicant for or holder of a license, certificate of registration, or other legal authorization issued by a licensing agency to practice in a specific occupation or profession that is provided to the licensing agency is confidential and not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code.

Occ. Code § 58.001. Accordingly, we find that the licensee's social security number is confidential under section 58.001 of the Occupations Code and thus must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

We now turn to the remaining submitted information. Some of this information constitutes medical records, access to which is governed by the Medical Practice Act ("MPA"), chapter 159 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 provides in pertinent 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). This office has concluded that the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends 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). Further, information that is subject to the MPA also includes information that was obtained from medical records. *See* Occ. Code § 159.002(a), (b), (c); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). We have further found that when a file is created as the result of a hospital stay, all the documents in the file relating to diagnosis and treatment constitute physician-patient communications or “[r]ecords of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that are created or maintained by a physician.” Open Records Decision No. 546 (1990).

Medical records must be released upon the governmental body’s receipt of the patient’s signed, written consent, provided that the consent specifies (1) the information to be covered by the release, (2) reasons or purposes for the release, and (3) the person to whom the information is to be released. *See* Occ. Code §§ 159.004, .005. 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). Based on our review of the submitted information, we find that portions of this information, which we have marked, are subject to the MPA. Absent the applicability of an MPA access provision, the board must withhold this information pursuant to the MPA.

We next note that some of the records at issue are podiatric records, access to which is governed by chapter 202 of the Occupations Code. Section 202.402 of the Occupations Code provides in part:

(b) Records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a podiatrist that is created or maintained by a podiatrist are confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this subchapter.

(c) A person who receives information from confidential communications or podiatric records, other than a person listed under Section 202.405 or 202.406 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 § 202.402(b), (c). The podiatric records must be released upon the patient’s signed, written consent, provided that the consent specifies (1) the information to be covered by the release, (2) reasons or purposes for the release, and (3) the person to whom the information is to be released. Occ. Code §§ 202.405, 406. Section 202.402(c) also requires that any subsequent release of podiatric records be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. *Cf.* Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990)

(release of medical records must be consistent with purposes for which governmental body obtained the records). Podiatric records may be released only as provided under the Occupations Code. *Cf.* Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991) (release of medical records regulated by MPA). We have marked the documents which are podiatric records subject to the Occupations Code.

The remaining submitted information also includes records of chiropractic treatment. Chapter 201 of the Occupations Code governs the practice of chiropractic. Section 201.402 of the Occupations Code provides in part:

(a) Communications between a chiropractor and a patient relating to or in connection with any professional services provided by a chiropractor to the patient are confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this subchapter.

(b) Records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a chiropractor that are created or maintained by a chiropractor are confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this subchapter.

(c) A person who receives information from the confidential communications or records, excluding a person listed in Section 201.404(a) 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 § 201.402(a)-(c). Chapter 201 includes exceptions to confidentiality and consent provisions. *See id.* §§ 201.403, 404, 405. We have marked the information that is subject to chapter 201 of the Occupations Code. The board may release this information only if chapter 201 of the Occupations Code permits the board to do so.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common law privacy, which protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). 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. In addition, this office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common law privacy: an individual's criminal history when compiled by a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision No. 565 (citing *United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749 (1989)); personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a

governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990); 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); and identities of victims of sexual abuse, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982). We have reviewed the submitted records and indicated the information that must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common law privacy.

You state that portions of the submitted information constitute communications regarding the patient and named chiropractor and are excepted under section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002).

First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *See In re Texas Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *See Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

After reviewing your claims and the submitted information, we conclude that you have not demonstrated that any of the submitted information was communicated between or among privileged parties or otherwise constitutes privileged attorney-client communications. We therefore conclude that you may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 52.107(1).

Next, you contend that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Section 552.108(a) generally excepts information held by a law enforcement agency 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1), (2). Section 552.108(b) generally excepts an internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement, if release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution. *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1), (2). A governmental body that claims information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why section 552.108 is applicable to the information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977); Open Records Decision No. 434 at 2-3 (1986).

The board is not a law enforcement agency. *See* Open Records Decision No. 199 (1978) (agency whose function is essentially regulatory in nature is not "law enforcement agency" for purposes of statutory predecessor to section 552.108). By its terms, section 552.108 applies only to a law enforcement agency or a prosecutor. This office has determined, however, that where an incident involving alleged criminal conduct is still under active investigation or prosecution, section 552.108 may be invoked by any proper custodian of information that relates to the incident. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 474 (1987), 372 (1983) (where incident involving allegedly criminal conduct is still under active investigation or prosecution, section 552.108 may be invoked by any proper custodian of information relating to incident). Where a non-law enforcement agency has custody of information relating to a pending case of a law enforcement agency, the agency having custody of the information may withhold the information under section 552.108 if the agency demonstrates that the information relates to the pending case and provides this office with a representation from the law enforcement entity that the law enforcement entity wishes to withhold the information. In this case, we find that the board has failed to demonstrate that the information at issue relates to a pending case. Furthermore, you have not provided this office with a representation from any law enforcement entity that wishes to withhold the information. We therefore determine that the board may not withhold any of the submitted information pursuant to section 552.108 of the Government Code.

You also contend that the requested records include information that is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code. This section provides that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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."

Gov't Code § 552.136. We have marked the information that the board must withhold pursuant to this exception.

You contend that Exhibit C contains an e-mail address excepted under section 552.137 of the Government Code. 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 Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). We note that section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee's work e-mail address because such an address is not that of the employee as a "member of the public" but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. We also note that section 552.137 does not apply to a business's general e-mail address or website address.

The e-mail address at issue does not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Therefore, unless the individual at issue consents to release of the e-mail address, the board must withhold it in accordance with section 552.137.

In summary, it appears that the board received one of the transcripts from an educational institution, San Jacinto College. If so, pursuant to sections 1232g(b)(4)(B) and 99.33(a)(2), the board may only release this transcript upon consent of the named chiropractor. If the board did not receive the transcript from the college, then it may not withhold this transcript under FERPA. Likewise, it does not appear that the board received the remaining transcripts from McLennan Community College, the University of Missouri, or the Texas Chiropractic College. Thus, the board may not withhold the remaining transcripts under FERPA. The named chiropractor's social security number is confidential under section 58.001 of the Occupations Code and thus must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Podiatric records may be released only as provided under chapter 202 of the Occupations Code. Medical records may only be released in accordance with the MPA. The board may only release the marked chiropractic records in accordance with chapter 201 of the Occupations Code. We have marked the information that the board must withhold under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The board must also withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 and the e-mail address under section 552.137, unless the individual at issue consents to release of the e-mail address. The remaining submitted information must be released. Because our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments.

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 Dep't of Pub. 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 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,



Sarah I. Swanson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SIS/krl

Ref: ID# 202136

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Mary Mcfaul
1250 Main Street, Suite 1600
Springfield, Ma 01103
(w/o enclosures)