



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 17, 2007

Mr. Larry M. Thompson
Assistant District Attorney
Tarrant County
1025 South Jennings, Suite 300
Fort Worth, Texas 76104

OR2007-10617

Dear Mr. Thompson:

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# 286891.

The Tarrant County Hospital District (the "district") received a request for a copy of a specific complaint made against the district. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision" and encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. *See* Gov't Code § 552.101. Medical peer review is defined by the Medical Practice Act (the "MPA"), found at subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, to mean "the evaluation of medical and health care services, including evaluation of the qualifications of professional health care practitioners and of patient care rendered by those practitioners." Occ. Code § 151.002(a)(7). Medical peer review includes evaluation of the "merits of a complaint relating to a health care practitioner and a determination or recommendation regarding the complaint." *Id.* § 151.002(a)(7)(A). A medical peer review committee is "a committee of a health care entity . . . or the medical staff of a health care entity, that operates under written bylaws approved by the policy-making body or the governing board of the health care entity and is authorized to evaluate the quality of medical and health care services[.]" *Id.* § 151.002(a)(8). Section 160.007 of the MPA states that, "[e]xcept as otherwise provided by this subtitle, each proceeding or record of a medical peer

review committee is confidential, and any communication made to a medical peer review committee is privileged.” *Id.* § 160.007.

Section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code provides in part:

(a) The records and proceedings of a medical committee are confidential and are not subject to court subpoena.

...

(c) Records, information, or reports of a medical committee . . . and records, information, or reports provided by a medical committee . . . to the governing body of a public hospital . . . are not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code.

...

(f) This section and Subchapter A, Chapter 160, Occupations Code, do not apply to records made or maintained in the regular course of business by a hospital, health maintenance organization, medical organization, university medical center or health science center, hospital district, hospital authority, or extended care facility.

Health & Safety Code §§ 161.032(a), (c), (f). Section 161.031(a) defines a “medical committee” as “any committee . . . of (1) a hospital. . . .” *Id.* § 161.031(a)(1). Section 161.031(b) provides that the “term includes a committee appointed ad hoc to conduct a specific investigation or established under state or federal law or rule or under the bylaws or rules of the organization or institution.” *Id.* § 161.031(b). Section 161.0315 provides in relevant part that “[t]he governing body of a hospital [or] medical organization . . . may form a medical peer review committee, as defined by Section 151.002, Occupations Code, or a medical committee, as defined by Section 161.031, to evaluate medical and health care services . . .” *Id.* § 161.0315(a).

However, neither section 160.007 nor section 161.032 makes confidential “records made or maintained in the regular course of business by a hospital[.]” *Id.* § 161.032(f); see *Memorial Hosp.-The Woodlands v. McCown*, 927 S.W.2d 1, 10 (Tex. 1996) (stating that reference to statutory predecessor to section 160.007 in section 161.032 is clear signal that records should accorded same treatment under both statutes in determining if they were made in regular course of business). The phrase “records made or maintained in the regular course of business” has been construed to mean records that are neither created nor obtained in connection with a medical committee’s deliberative proceedings. See *McCown*, 927 S.W.2d at 9-10 (Tex. 1996) (discussing *Barnes v. Whittington*, 751 S.W.2d 493 (Tex. 1988), and *Jordan v. Court of Appeals for Fourth Supreme Judicial Dist.*, 701 S.W.2d 644 (Tex. 1985)).

You describe the submitted information as a “Patient Complaint” report taken by an agent of the Medical Committee/Peer Review Committee. You state that “part of the function of the Medical Committee/Peer Review Committee is the review of Patient Complaints.” Further, you explain that the submitted information is used exclusively for committee purposes. You argue that the submitted information is therefore confidential under section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code. Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we agree that this information constitutes records of a medical peer review committee, or medical committee, and, thus, is confidential under section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code. Accordingly, the submitted information must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹

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); *Texas Dep’t of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

¹As our ruling on this issue is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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/mcf

Ref: ID# 286891

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jeff Stanglin
Attorney at Law
The Coffey Firm
4700 Airport Freeway, Suite B
Fort Worth, Texas 76117
(w/o enclosures)