ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 3, 2008

Ms. Helen K. Bright
The University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2008-13167A

Dear Ms. Bright:

This office issued Open Records Letter No. 2008-13167 (2008) on September 25, 2008. We have examined this ruling and determined that it needs clarification. Consequently, this decision serves as the correct ruling and is a substitute for the decision issued on September 25, 2008. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.011 (providing that Office of Attorney General may issue decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of Public Information Act ("Act")). Your request was assigned ID# 321524.

The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston (the "university") received a request for a specified subpoena involving the practice-plan billing practices of UT Physicians and the university's response to the subpoena. You state you will redact social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147 of the Government Code.[1] You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.136 of the Government Code. You also indicate that release of the requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of the Harris County Hospital District (the "district"). Accordingly, you have notified the district of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Act in certain

[1]We note that section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act.

circumstances). We have received correspondence on behalf of the district. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that section 552.022 of the Government Code is applicable to some of the submitted information. Section 552.022(a)(3) provides for required public disclosure of "information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body," unless the information is expressly confidential under other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3). Sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.108 are not other law that makes information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022(a)(3). Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 473 (1987) (section 552.103 may be waived), 177 (1977) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.108). Therefore, the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3), a representative sample of which we have marked, may not be withheld under sections 552.103, 552.107, or 552.108.

However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are other law within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). Accordingly, we will consider the university's assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 for the information subject to section 552.022. In addition, we will address the university's claims under sections 552.101 and 552.136 of the Government Code for the documents that are subject to section 552.022. We will also consider the university's claims under sections 552.103, 552.107, and 552.108 with respect to the remaining information that is not subject to section 552.022.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code 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. You claim that the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA"), 42 U.S.C. §§ 1320d-1320d-8, governs portions of the submitted information. At the direction of Congress, the Secretary of Health and Human Services ("HHS") promulgated regulations setting privacy standards for medical records, which HHS issued as the Federal Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information. *See* Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996, 42 U.S.C. § 1320d-2 (Supp. IV 1998) (historical & statutory note); Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information, 45 C.F.R. Pts.160, 164 ("Privacy Rule"); *see also* Attorney General Opinion JC-0508 at 2 (2002). These standards govern the releasability of protected health information by a covered entity. *See* 45 C.F.R. pts. 160, 164. Under these standards, a covered entity may not use or disclose protected health information, except as provided by parts 160 and 164 of the Code of Federal Regulations. 45 C.F.R. § 164.502(a).

This office addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act in Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004). In that decision, we noted that section 164.512 of title 45 of the Code of

Federal Regulations provides that a covered entity may use or disclose protected health information to the extent that such use or disclosure is required by law and the use or disclosure complies with and is limited to the relevant requirements of such law. *See* 45 C.F.R. § 164.512(a)(1). We further noted that the Act "is a mandate in Texas law that compels Texas governmental bodies to disclose information to the public." *See* Open Records Decision No. 681 at 8 (2004); *see also* Gov't Code §§ 552.002, .003, .021. We therefore held that the disclosures under the Act come within section 164.512(a). Consequently, the Privacy Rule does not make information confidential for the purpose of section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Abbott v. Tex. Dep't of Mental Health & Mental Retardation*, 212 S.W.3d 648 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.); ORD 681 at 9; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 478 (1987) (as general rule, statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential). Because the Privacy Rule does not make confidential information that is subject to disclosure under the Act, the university may withhold requested protected health information from the public only if the information is confidential under other law or an exception in subchapter C of the Act applies.

You also argue that the information subject to section 552.022 is confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with the Medical Practice Act ("MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 of the MPA 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), (b), (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). Upon review, we conclude none of the information at issue consists of medical records that are subject to the MPA. Thus, the university may not withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022 under the MPA.

Section 552.101 also encompasses sections 12.003 and 21.012 of the Human Resources Code, which the university states excepts the information subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 12.003 provides in relevant part:

> (a) Except for purposes directly connected with the administration of the [Texas Department of Human Services'] assistance programs, it is an offense for a person to solicit, disclose, receive, or make use of, or to authorize, knowingly permit, participate in, or acquiesce in the use of the names of, *or any information* concerning, persons applying for or receiving assistance if the information is directly or indirectly derived from the records, papers, files, or communications of the department or acquired by employees of the department in the performance of their official duties.

Hum. Res. Code § 12.003(a) (emphasis added). In Open Records Decision No. 584 (1991), this office concluded that "[t]he inclusion of the words 'or any information' juxtaposed with the prohibition on disclosure of the names of the department's clients clearly expresses a legislative intent to encompass the broadest range of individual client information, and not merely the clients' names and addresses." *Id.* at 3. Consequently, it is the specific information pertaining to individual clients, and not merely the clients' identities, that is made confidential under section 12.003. *See* Hum. Res. Code § 21.012(a) (requiring provision of safeguards that restrict use or disclosure of information concerning applicants for or recipients of assistance programs to purposes directly connected with administration of programs); Open Records Decision No. 166 (1977). Upon review, we find that the university has failed to demonstrate how the information at issue discloses information concerning individual applicants and recipients of assistance programs. Therefore, the university may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with sections 12.003 and 21.012 of the Human Resources Code.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrines of common-law privacy and constitutional privacy. The doctrine of common-law privacy excepts from public disclosure private information about an individual if the information (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. Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 440 (1986), 393 (1983), 339 (1982) (sexual assault victim has common-law privacy interest that prevents disclosure of information that would identify the victim).

Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. ORD 455 at 4. The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* at 7. The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common-law doctrine of privacy; constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for "the most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)).

Upon review, we find none of the information subject to section 552.022 constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing information that is of no legitimate concern to the public. Further, we find that the university has failed to demonstrate how any portion of the information at issue falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the university may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with either common-law or constitutional privacy.

Rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence encompasses the attorney-client privilege and provides:

> A client has a privilege to refuse to disclose and to prevent any other person from disclosing confidential communications made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the client:
>
> > (A) between the client or a representative of the client and the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer;
> >
> > (B) between the lawyer and the lawyer's representative;
> >
> > (C) by the client or a representative of the client, or the client's lawyer or a representative of the lawyer, to a lawyer or a representative of a lawyer representing another party in a pending action and concerning a matter of common interest therein;
> >
> > (D) between representatives of the client or between the client and a representative of the client; or
> >
> > (E) among lawyers and their representatives representing the same client.

TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). A communication is "confidential" if 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). Thus, in order to withhold attorney-client privileged information from disclosure under rule 503, a governmental body must: (1) show that the document is a communication transmitted between privileged parties or reveals a confidential communication; (2) identify the parties involved in the communication; and (3) show that the communication is confidential by explaining that it was not intended to be disclosed to third persons and that it was made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client. Upon a demonstration of all three factors, the information is privileged and confidential under rule 503, provided the client has not waived the privilege or the document does not fall within the purview of the exceptions to the privilege enumerated in rule 503(d). *Pittsburgh Corning Corp. v. Caldwell*, 861 S.W.2d 423, 427 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1993, no writ).

The information at issue consists of checks from UT Physicians to third parties. The university has failed to explain how this information constitutes communications between privileged parties. Thus, we conclude the university has failed to establish that rule 503 is applicable to the information at issue, and no portion of it may be withheld on this basis.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code 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. Accordingly, the university must withhold the bank account and routing numbers, a representative sample of which we have marked, under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We now turn to your arguments for the submitted information that is not subject to section 552.022. Section 552.108(a)(1) excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor 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." *Id.* § 552.108. A governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1), 552.301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). Section 552.108 may be invoked by the proper custodian of information relating to an investigation or prosecution of criminal conduct. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 474 at 4-5 (1987). Where a governmental body possesses information relating to a pending case of a law enforcement agency, the governmental body agency may withhold the information under section 552.108 if (1) it demonstrates that the information relates to the pending case and (2) this office is provided with a representation from the law enforcement entity that the law enforcement entity wishes to withhold the information. You inform us that the United States Department of Justice objects to the release of the requested information because it pertains to an ongoing criminal investigation.

Based on this representation, we conclude that the release of the submitted information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e.*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases). Therefore, the university may withhold the submitted information that is not subject to section 552.022 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of the types of information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code, the university must release the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code. The university may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108 of the Government Code.[2]

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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 challenge that decision by suing the governmental

---

[2]As our ruling is dipositive, we do not address the remaining arguments against discloure.

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,



Amy L.S. Shipp
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ALS/jb

Ref: ID# 321524

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Todd Ackerman
Houston Chronicle
801 Texas Avenue
Houston, Texas 77002
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. James Downes
Assistant County Attorney
Harris County
2525 Holly Hall, Suite 190
Houston, Texas 77054
(w/o enclosures)