



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 20, 2012

Ms. Neera Chatterjee
Office of the General Counsel
The University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2012-00982

Dear Ms. Chatterjee:

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# 442814 (OGC# 140492).

The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center (the “university”) received a request for information concerning a named individual. You state some information has been released to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

We note the requestor has excluded patient-identifying information and the named individual’s social security number, IRS-related information, and personal banking information from his request. Therefore, this information is not responsive to the request. Additionally, we have marked a portion of the submitted information that does not pertain to the named employee specified in the request. Thus, this information is also not responsive to the request. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the university is not required to release non-responsive information in response to this request.

¹We assume the “representative sample” of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Next, we address your argument that some of the remaining submitted information is not subject to the Act. You contend that, pursuant to section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code, the submitted information is not subject to the Act. Section 181.006 states “[f]or a covered entity that is a governmental unit, an individual’s protected health information . . . is not public information and is not subject to disclosure under [the Act].” Health & Safety Code § 181.006(2). Section 181.006(2) does not remove protected health information from the Act’s application, but rather states this information is “not public information and is not subject to disclosure under [the Act].” *Id.* We interpret this to mean a covered entity’s protected health information is subject to the Act’s application. Furthermore, this statute, when demonstrated to be applicable, makes confidential the information it covers. Thus, we will consider your arguments for this information, as well as the other submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, such as the Family and Medical Leave Act (the “FMLA”). *See* 29 U.S.C. § 2601 *et seq.* Section 825.500 of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations identifies the record-keeping requirements for employers that are subject to the FMLA. Section 825.500(g) states

[r]ecords and documents relating to certifications, recertifications or medical histories of employees or employees’ family members, created for purposes of FMLA, shall be maintained as confidential medical records in separate files/records from the usual personnel files, and if the [Americans with Disabilities Act (the “ADA”)], as amended, is also applicable, such records shall be maintained in conformance with ADA confidentiality requirements . . . except that:

- (1) Supervisors and managers may be informed regarding necessary restrictions on the work or duties of an employee and necessary accommodations;
- (2) First aid and safety personnel may be informed (when appropriate) if the employee’s physical or medical condition might require emergency treatment; and
- (3) Government officials investigating compliance with FMLA (or other pertinent law) shall be provided relevant information upon request.

29 C.F.R. § 825.500(g). Upon review, we find the information you have marked is confidential under section 825.500 of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations. Further, we find none of the release provisions of the FMLA apply to the information. Accordingly, the university must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the

Government Code in conjunction with section 825.500 of title 29 of the Code of Federal Regulations.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code, which 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, medical peer review committee, . . . and records, information, or reports provided by a medical committee, medical peer review committee, . . . to the governing body of a public hospital . . . are not subject to disclosure under [the Act].

...

(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) (footnote omitted). Section 161.031(a) defines a “medical committee” as “any committee . . . of . . . (3) a university medical school or health science center[.]” *Id.* § 161.031(a)(3). Section 161.0315 provides, in relevant part, “[t]he governing body of a hospital [or] university medical school or health science center . . . 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).

The precise scope of the “medical committee” provision has been the subject of a number of judicial decisions. *See, e.g., Memorial Hosp.—The Woodlands v. McCown*, 927 S.W.2d 1 (Tex. 1996); *Barnes v. Whittington*, 751 S.W.2d 493 (Tex. 1988); *Jordan v. Fourth Supreme Judicial Dist.*, 701 S.W.2d 644 (Tex. 1986). These cases establish “documents generated by the committee in order to conduct open and thorough review” are confidential. *Mem’l Hosp.*, 927 S.W.2d at 10; *Jordan*, 701 S.W.2d at 647-48; *Doctor’s Hosp. v. West*, 765 S.W.2d 812, 814 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1988). This protection extends “to documents that have been prepared by or at the direction of the committee for committee purposes.” *Jordan*, 701 S.W. 2d at 647-48. Protection does not extend to documents

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

“gratuitously submitted to a committee” or “created without committee impetus and purpose.” *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 591 (1991) (construing statutory predecessor to Health & Safety Code § 161.032). Additionally, we note section 161.032 does not make confidential “records made or maintained in the regular course of business by a hospital[.]” Health & Safety Code § 161.032(f); *see also Mem’l Hosp.*, 927 S.W.2d at 10 (stating reference to statutory predecessor to section 160.007 of the Occupations Code in section 161.032 is clear signal records should be accorded same treatment under both statutes in determining if they were made in ordinary 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 Mem’l Hosp.*, 927 S.W.2d at 10 (discussing *Barnes*, 751 S.W.2d 493, and *Jordan*, 701 S.W.2d 644).

You state the documents you have marked were created by or for the university’s Credentialing and Privileges Committee and Professional Liability Committee. You provide detail as to each of the functions and roles of these committees and state these committees each assess the professional skill and care of physicians. Upon review, we find the information you have marked was prepared at the direction of the named medical and peer review committees and for committee purposes. Accordingly, the university must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code.³

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information that comes within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *See In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. *See* TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

applies only to a confidential communication, *id.*, meaning it was “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). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *See Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no pet.). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You seek to withhold portions of the remaining information under section 552.107(1). You state the information consists of communications between university attorneys and university employees made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. You also state the communications were made in confidence and the confidentiality has been maintained. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the university may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.⁴

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law right to 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). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be met. *Id.* at 681-82. This office has found financial information that does not relate to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body ordinarily satisfies the first requirement of the test for common-law privacy. For example, information related to an individual’s mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history is generally protected by the common-law right to privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 545 (1990), 523 (1989); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (public employee’s withholding allowance certificate, designation of beneficiary of employee’s retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and employee’s decisions regarding voluntary benefits programs are protected under common-law privacy). However, there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* ORDs 600 at 9 (information revealing employee participation in group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by governmental body is not excepted from disclosure), 545 (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common-law

⁴As our ruling for this information is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

privacy). Upon review, we find the information we have marked under common-law privacy constitutes personal financial details that are not of legitimate public interest. Therefore, the university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the remaining information you seek to withhold on this basis is not highly intimate or embarrassing information and of no legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the university may not withhold any of the remaining information on the basis of common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy, which 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. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (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 the United States Supreme Court has recognized. See *Fadjo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981); ORD 455 at 3-7. The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. See *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985); ORD 455 at 6-7. This aspect of constitutional privacy balances the individual's privacy interest against the public's interest in the information. See ORD 455 at 7. Constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for "the most intimate aspects of human affairs" and the scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common-law doctrine of privacy. *Id.* at 5 (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492). In this instance, you have not demonstrated how constitutional privacy applies to any portion of the information at issue. Accordingly, no portion of the information at issue may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from 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). The Texas Supreme Court recently held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, No. 08-0172, 2010 WL 4910163 (Tex. Dec. 3, 2010). Accordingly, the university must withhold the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117 excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security 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. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by 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). Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117 on behalf of current or former officials or employees only if these individuals made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this

information was made. Accordingly, if the employee whose information is at issue timely elected to keep his personal information confidential pursuant to section 552.024, the university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1). The university may not withhold this information under section 552.117 for an employee who did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential.

In summary, the university must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction in conjunction with the FMLA and with section 161.032 of the Health and Safety Code. The university may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. To the extent the employee whose information is at issue timely-elected confidentiality under section 552.024, the university must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The university must release the remaining responsive 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, 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,



Cynthia G. Tynan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CGT/em

Ref: ID# 442814

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)