



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

September 16, 2011

Ms. Michelle L. Villarreal  
Assistant City Attorney  
Legal Services  
City of Waco  
P.O. Box 2570  
Waco, Texas 76702-2570

OR2011-13421

Dear Ms. Villarreal:

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# 430182 (City of Waco Reference # LGL-11-916; WPD 11-596).

The Waco Police Department (the "department") received a request for the case file for a named individual who died in custody. You claim 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.

Initially, we note the submitted information contains medical records. 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 exception encompasses the Medical Practice Act (the "MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in part:

(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(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). We have also found that when a file is created as the result of a hospital stay, all the documents in the file relating to diagnosis and treatment constitute physician-patient communications or “[r]ecords of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that are created or maintained by a physician.” Open Records Decision No. 546 (1990). Medical records must be released upon the governmental body’s receipt of the patient’s signed, written consent, provided that 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. When a patient is deceased, as is the case here, medical records pertaining to the deceased patient may only be released on the signed written consent of the decedent’s personal representative. *See id.* § 159.005(a)(5). Although you claim the submitted medical records are excepted under section 552.103 of the Government Code, the MPA’s specific right of access provision prevails over the Act’s general exceptions to disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision No. 451 at 4 (1986) (specific statutory right of access provisions overcome general exceptions to disclosure under statutory predecessor to Act). We have marked the documents in the submitted information that constitute medical records, and thus may only be released in accordance with the MPA.

You claim that the remaining submitted information is protected under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in part:

(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 that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documentation sufficient to establish the applicability of this exception to the information that it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body receives the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to the pending or anticipated litigation. *See 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). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

In order to demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation might ensue is more than a mere conjecture.” Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body’s receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party.<sup>1</sup> Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982).

You contend the department reasonably anticipated litigation on the date the department received the present request for information. You state the information at issue concerns a custodial death. You further state the family members of the deceased individual have spoken to department officers with hostile tones and expressed dissatisfaction with the department’s explanation regarding the incident at issue. Furthermore, you state, and provide documentation demonstrating, an attorney retained by the family members sent an e-mail to the department advising that the attorney was retained in order to investigate certain aspects of the incident at issue. However, you do not inform our office that, at the time the department received the present request, anyone had taken any concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation against the department regarding this matter. Consequently, we find you have failed to demonstrate the department reasonably anticipated litigation when it received the present request for information. As such, we conclude the department may not withhold any of the remaining submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information that (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 type of information considered intimate or 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.

---

<sup>1</sup>In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

However, because privacy is a personal right that lapses at death, the common-law right to privacy does not encompass information that relates only to a deceased individual. Accordingly, information pertaining to a deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law privacy grounds. 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.); see also Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981) (privacy rights lapse upon death). We note the remaining submitted information pertains solely to a deceased individual. Upon review, we find the department has failed to demonstrate how any portion of the remaining submitted information is subject to common-law privacy. Therefore, the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the department may only release the medical records we have marked pursuant to the MPA. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, the department must release the remaining submitted information.

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](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, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Sean Nottingham  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

SN/agn

Ref: ID# 430182

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)