



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 21, 2005

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

OR2005-05472

Dear Ms. Smith:

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# 226663.

The Texas Board of Chiropractic Examiners (the "board") received a request for all files related to a licensed chiropractor. You state that you have released some of the requested information, but you claim that portions of the remaining requested information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.026, 552.101, 552.107, 552.114, and 552.130 of the Government Code. 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." This section encompasses the common-law right of 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 types 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: 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 marked a small portion of information that the board must withhold under section 552.101 on the basis of common-law privacy.

The Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 (“FERPA”), which is also encompassed by section 552.101, 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). Section 552.114 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure student records at an educational institution funded completely or in part by state revenue. This office generally applies the same analysis under section 552.114 and FERPA. 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).

You state the educational records you have submitted in Exhibit A “are original transcripts received directly from the educational institution[s].” On this basis, we find that the board may only release these transcripts on consent of the named chiropractor in accordance with sections 1232g(b)(4)(B) of the United States Code and 99.33(a)(2) of the Code of Federal Regulations.

Additionally, we note that you have marked a social security number in the submitted information. Section 58.001 of the Occupations Code, which is also encompassed by section 552.101 of the Government 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 § 58.001.¹ As the social security number in the submitted documents is the social security number of a licensee, 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.

¹As of the date of this letter ruling, two different sections of the Occupations Code are denominated as section 58.001. The section relating to “[t]he 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” was renumbered from section 56.001 of the Occupations Code to section 58.001 of the Occupations Code by the Act of May 20, 2003, 78th Leg., R.S., ch. 1275, § 2(112), 2003 Tex. Gen. Laws 4140, 4146.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming 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. 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. 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. *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 a 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. 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. *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 this 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 552.107(1).

Additionally, you seek to withhold the marked Texas driver’s license number 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[.]

Gov't Code § 552.130. You must withhold the marked Texas driver's license number under section 552.130.

In summary, you must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The board may only release the submitted transcripts on consent of the named chiropractor in accordance with sections 1232g(b)(4)(B) of the United States Code and 99.33(a)(2) of the Code of Federal Regulations. The marked social security number must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 58.001 of the Occupations Code. The marked Texas driver's license number must be withheld under section 552.130. The remaining 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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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); *Tex. 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,



Elizabeth A. Stephens
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EAS/krl

Ref: ID#226663

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Steve Tipton
Flahive, Ogden & Latson
P. O. Drawer 13367
Austin, TX 78711
(w/o enclosures)