ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 17, 2009

Ms. Amy L. Sims
Assistant City Attorney
City of Lubbock
P.O. Box 2000
Lubbock, Texas 79457

OR2009-05119

Dear Ms. Sims:

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# 340415.

The City of Lubbock (the "city") received a request for a specified worker's compensation claim. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.117 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." 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 city 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 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 city may not withhold any of the information under the MPA.

You also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 181.101 of the Health and Safety Code. Section 181.101 provides that "[a] covered entity shall

comply with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act and Privacy Standards relating to . . . (3) uses and disclosures of protected health information, including requirements relating to consent[.]" Health & Safety Code § 181.101(3). However, section 181.101 was repealed effective September 1, 2003. *See* Acts 2001, 77th Leg., R.S., ch. 1511, § 1, 2001 Tex. Gen. Laws 5384, repealed by Act of April 10, 2003, 78th Leg., R.S., ch. 3, 2003 Tex. Sess. Law Serv. 5. We therefore conclude that the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 181.101 of the Health and Safety Code.

Section 552.101 also encompasses section 402.083(a) of the Labor Code, which provides that "[i]nformation in or derived from a claim file regarding an employee is confidential and may not be disclosed by the [Division of Workers' Compensation of the Texas Department of Insurance (the "division")] except as provided by this subtitle[.]" Labor Code § 402.083(a). In Open Records Decision No. 533 (1989), the City of Brownsville had received a request for similar information. This office construed the predecessor to section 402.083(a) to apply only to information that the governmental body obtained from the Industrial Accident Board, subsequently the Texas Workers' Compensation Commission, and now the division. *See* Open Records Decision No. 533 at 3-6; *see also* Labor Code § 402.086 (transferring confidentiality conferred by Labor Code § 402.083(a) to information that other parties obtain from division files). Accordingly, information in the possession of the city that was not obtained from the division may not be withheld on the basis of section 402.083(a). Upon review, we find that you have failed to explain or represent that the city received the documents at issue from the division. Therefore, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 402.083(a).

Section 552.102(a) excepts from public 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). Section 552.102 is applicable to information that relates to public officials and employees. *See* Open Records Decision No. 327 at 2 (1982) (anything relating to employee's employment and its terms constitutes information relevant to person's employment relationship and is part of employee's personnel file). The privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy standard under section 552.101. *See Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Tex. Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.) (addressing statutory predecessor). In *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), the Texas Supreme Court held that information is protected by common-law privacy 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 a legitimate concern to the public. To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. 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. Upon review, we agree the submitted documents contain information about a city employee

which may be considered intimate and embarrassing. However, because this information pertains to a workers' compensation claim, we find there is a legitimate public interest in this information. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job performance of public employees); 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). Accordingly, the submitted information may not be withheld under either section 552.101 or section 552.102 on the basis of common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses, telephone numbers, social security numbers, personal cellular telephone 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. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular piece of information is protected under section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). You state, and provide documentation showing, that the employee at issue timely elected to keep her personal information confidential. Thus, the city must withhold information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1). None of the remaining information you have marked is excepted under section 552.117(a)(1), and the city may not withhold any of it on that basis.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,

Paige Savoie

Paige Savoie
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PS/eeg

Ref: ID# 340415

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)