



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 22, 2007

Mr. Craig Magnuson
City of Mansfield Attorney
1305 East Broad Street
Mansfield, Texas 76063

OR2007-10839

Dear Mr. Magnuson:

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# 287310.

The Mansfield Police Department (the "department") received a request for information related to a fatal traffic accident. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the submitted information includes completed reports that are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in pertinent part:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1), the department may only withhold the completed reports if they are confidential under other law or excepted from

disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. *Id.* Although you argue that the reports are excepted under section 552.103 of the Government Code, this section is a discretionary exception and, as such, is not “other law” for purposes of section 552.022. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); *Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5* (discretionary exceptions generally), 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 subject to waiver). Therefore, the submitted reports may not be withheld under section 552.103.

We next address your argument under section 552.103 for the submitted information that is not subject to section 552.022. Section 552.103 provides in part as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person’s office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov’t Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref’d n.r.e.); *Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4* (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

In support of your claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103, your only argument is that “[t]he information requested relates to a civil case in the 18th District Court, Johnson County, Texas, litigation to which the City of Mansfield is a party.” You do not inform us whether the lawsuit was pending when the department received the request. Furthermore, because you have not informed us of the underlying cause of action or subject matter of the litigation, we are unable to determine how the requested information is related to the lawsuit. Therefore, you have failed to demonstrate

that section 552.103 is applicable to the submitted information. Accordingly, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note, however, that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹ Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Some of the submitted documents consist of medical records, access to which is governed by the Medical Practices Act (the “MPA”). Occ. Code §§ 151.001-165.160. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in 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.

Id. § 159.002(a)-(c). 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). Furthermore, we have concluded that when a file is created as the result of a hospital stay, all of the documents in the file that relate to diagnosis and treatment constitute either physician-patient communications or records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that are created or maintained by a physician. *See* Open Records Decision No. 546 (1990). We note that section 159.001 of the MPA defines “patient” as a person who consults with or is seen by a physician to receive medical care. *See* Occ. Code § 159.001(3). Under this definition, a deceased person cannot be a “patient” under section 159.002 of the MPA. Thus, section 159.002 is applicable only to the medical records of a person who was alive at the time of the diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment. Medical records must be released upon the patient’s signed, written consent, provided that

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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. Any subsequent release of medical records must be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. *See id.* § 159.002(c); Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). We have marked the medical records that are subject to the MPA. The department may only disclose these records in accordance with the access provisions of the MPA. Absent the applicability of an MPA access provision, the department must withhold these records pursuant to the MPA. *See* Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991).

Section 552.101 also 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 some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). However, the common-law right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death, and therefore it does not encompass information that relates to a deceased individual. *See Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981). We have reviewed the submitted information and marked information that is confidential under common-law privacy. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

The remaining information includes Texas motor vehicle record information. Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides in relevant part the following:

(a) Information is excepted from the requirements 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(a)(1),(2). We note, however, that the purpose of section 552.130 is to protect the privacy interests of individuals. Since the right of privacy lapses at death, Texas motor vehicle record information that pertains to deceased individuals may not be withheld under section 552.130. *See generally Moore*, 589 S. W.2d at 491, *Justice*, 472 F. Supp. at 146-147; Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984); H-917 (1976); Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981). However, the department must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the submitted medical records, which we have marked, may only be released in accordance with the MPA. The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must also withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. 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); *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 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,



L. Joseph James
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LJJ/eeg

Ref: ID# 287310

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Sherri Heinzman
1 Red Bluff Court
Mansfield, Texas 76063
(w/o enclosures)