



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 9, 2004

Lieutenant Carol Taylor  
Records Manager  
Taylor County Sheriff's Department  
450 Pecan Street  
Abilene, Texas 79602-1692

OR2004-4716

Dear Lt. Taylor:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 203049.

The Taylor County Sheriff's Department (the "department") received a request for records regarding two named individuals "that refer to any termination, demotion, promotion, investigation, disciplinary actions, or counseling reports."<sup>1</sup> You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by 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 must address the department's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code. Under section 552.301(e), a governmental body receiving an open records request for information that it wishes to withhold pursuant to one of the exceptions to public disclosure is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving the 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.

---

<sup>1</sup>As you have not submitted a copy of the written request for information, we take our description from your brief.

You indicate that the department received the present request for information on March 26, 2004. Accordingly, you were required to submit a copy of the written request for information to this office no later than April 16, 2004. You have not submitted a copy of the written request for information to our office. Thus, we find that the department failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of 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 section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). You contend that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. This section is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects the governmental body's interests and may be waived by the governmental body. Thus, section 552.103 does not demonstrate a compelling reason to withhold information from the public. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). However, because your claims under sections 552.101 and 552.102 can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address your arguments under these exceptions.

However, we note that the submitted information includes arrest warrants. The 78th Legislature recently amended article 15.26 of the Code of Criminal Procedure to add language providing:

The arrest warrant, and any affidavit presented to the magistrate in support of the issuance of the warrant, is public information, and beginning immediately when the warrant is executed the magistrate's clerk shall make a copy of the warrant and the affidavit available for public inspection in the clerk's office during normal business hours. A person may request the clerk to provide copies of the warrant and affidavit on payment of the cost of providing the copies.

Crim Proc. Code art. 15.26. This provision makes the submitted arrest warrants expressly public. The exceptions found in the Public Information Act (the "Act") do not, as a general rule, apply to information that is made public by other statutes. *See* Open Records Decision No. 525 (1989) (statutory predecessor). Therefore, the department must release the submitted arrest warrants to the requestor.

We also note that the submitted information includes medical records, access to which is governed by the Medical Practice Act ("MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in pertinent part:

(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(b), (c). 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). 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).

The medical 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 §§ 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. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). The submitted medical records, which we have marked, may be released only as provided under the MPA. Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991).

You assert that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision” and encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. 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*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 683-85 (Tex. 1976), for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101. Accordingly, we will consider your section 552.101 and section 552.102 claims together.

In *Industrial Foundation*, the Texas Supreme Court stated that information is excepted from disclosure if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. 540 S.W.2d 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. In addition, this office has found that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are protected by common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, specific illnesses, procedures, and physical disabilities). Prior decisions of this office have also determined that personal financial information not related to a transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally not subject to a legitimate public interest and is therefore protected by common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992). We have marked the portions of the submitted information that the department must withhold under section 552.101 and common-law privacy.

We note that portions of the submitted information are subject to sections 560.001, 560.002, and 560.003 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 also encompasses information made confidential by statute. Sections 560.001, 560.002, and 560.003 provide as follows:

Sec. 560.001. DEFINITIONS. In this chapter:

- (1) "Biometric identifier" means a retina or iris scan, fingerprint, voiceprint, or record of hand or face geometry.
- (2) "Governmental body" has the meaning assigned by Section 552.003 [of the Government Code], except that the term includes each entity within or created by the judicial branch of state government.

Sec. 560.002. DISCLOSURE OF BIOMETRIC IDENTIFIER. A governmental body that possesses a biometric identifier of an individual:

- (1) may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose the biometric identifier to another person unless:
  - (A) the individual consents to the disclosure;
  - (B) the disclosure is required or permitted by a federal statute or by a state statute other than Chapter 552 [of the Government Code]; or

(C) the disclosure is made by or to a law enforcement agency for a law enforcement purpose; and

(2) shall store, transmit, and protect from disclosure the biometric identifier using reasonable care and in a manner that is the same as or more protective than the manner in which the governmental body stores, transmits, and protects its other confidential information.

Sec. 560.003. APPLICATION OF CHAPTER 552. A biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under Chapter 552.

Gov't Code §§ 560.001-.003. Upon review, we find that section 560.002 does not permit the disclosure of the submitted fingerprint information in this instance. Therefore, the department must withhold the fingerprint information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code.

The submitted documents also contain information that may be excepted from disclosure under section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(2) excepts from disclosure the home address, home telephone number, social security number, and the family member information of a peace officer as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. We are unable to determine from the information provided whether some of the employees at issue are licensed peace officers. If the employees at issue are licensed peace officers, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2). If the employees are not licensed peace officers, and if the employees elected to keep personal information confidential pursuant to section 552.024 prior to the date the department received the present request, then the department must withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1). If, however, the employees are not licensed peace officers and did not make a timely election pursuant to section 552.024, the department may not withhold this information under section 552.117.

However, even if section 552.117 does not apply, the marked social security numbers may be confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with the 1990 amendments to the federal Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I). *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). These amendments make confidential social security numbers and related records that are obtained or maintained by a state agency or political subdivision of the state pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. *See id.* We have no basis for concluding that social security numbers in the submitted documents are confidential under section 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), and therefore excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 on the basis of that federal provision. We caution, however, that section 552.352 of the Act imposes criminal penalties for the release of confidential

information. Prior to releasing social security numbers, the department should ensure that the social security numbers were not obtained and are not maintained by the department pursuant to any provision of law, enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

We note that portions of the submitted information are subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 excepts from disclosure information relating to a Texas motor vehicle driver's license and information relating to a Texas motor vehicle title or registration. Gov't Code § 552.130. The department must withhold the Texas motor vehicle information we have marked under section 552.130.

The submitted documents also contain information that is subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.137 of the Government Code provides:

(a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under this chapter.

(b) Confidential information described by this section that relates to a member of the public may be disclosed if the member of the public affirmatively consents to its release.

(c) Subsection (a) does not apply to an e-mail address:

(1) provided to a governmental body by a person who has a contractual relationship with the governmental body or by the contractor's agent;

(2) provided to a governmental body by a vendor who seeks to contract with the governmental body or by the vendor's agent;

(3) contained in a response to a request for bids or proposals, contained in a response to similar invitations soliciting offers or information relating to a potential contract, or provided to a governmental body in the course of negotiating the terms of a contract or potential contract; or

(4) provided to a governmental body on a letterhead, coversheet, printed document, or other document made available to the public.

(d) Subsection (a) does not prevent a governmental body from disclosing an e-mail address for any reason to another governmental body or to a federal agency.

Gov't Code § 552.137. Section 552.137 excepts certain e-mail addresses of members of the public that are not within the scope of section 552.137(c), unless the relevant members of the public have affirmatively consented to the release of the e-mail addresses. We note, however, that section 552.137 does not apply to the work e-mail addresses of officers or employees of a governmental body, a website address, or the general e-mail address of a business. We determine that the e-mail addresses we have marked are within the scope of section 552.137(a). Unless the department has received affirmative consent to disclose the e-mail addresses, the department must withhold the marked e-mail addresses under section 552.137.

In summary, the department must withhold the marked medical records pursuant to the MPA. The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with (1) common-law privacy and (2) section 560.003 of the Government Code. The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) if the employees at issue are licensed peace officers. If the employees at issue are not licensed peace officers, and if the employees at issue elected to keep personal information confidential pursuant to section 552.024, then the marked information must be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1). The marked social security numbers may be confidential under federal law. The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130. The department must withhold the marked e-mail addresses under section 552.137 unless consent to release has been granted. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

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,



Amy D. Peterson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ADP/sdk

Ref: ID# 203049

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Alfredo Solis  
641 EN 22<sup>nd</sup>  
Abilene, Texas 79601  
(w/o enclosures)