



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 1, 2013

Ms. Thao La
Senior Attorney
Parkland Health and Hospital System
5201 Harry Hines Boulevard
Dallas, Texas 75235

OR2013-03501

Dear Ms. La:

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# 480056 (DCHD# 12-308, 12-310, and 12-312).

The Dallas County Hospital District d/b/a Parkland Health and Hospital System (the "district") received three requests for specified videos and law enforcement communications involving a specified incident.¹ You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code. You also state release of the submitted information may implicate the interests of the Dallas County Sheriff's Department (the "sheriff's department"). Accordingly, you state you have notified the sheriff's department of these requests for information and its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released.² See Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

¹We note the district received clarification from one of the requestors regarding his request. See Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information); see *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

²As of the date of this letter, we have not received any correspondence from the sheriff's department.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code 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)(1). 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), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state, and have submitted a letter from the district’s police department (the “department”) stating, the submitted information relates to a pending criminal investigation being conducted by the department. Based upon these representations and our review, we conclude release of the information at issue 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) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976).

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov’t Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). Thus, with the exception of basic information, you may withhold the submitted information from disclosure under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.³

We will now address your remaining arguments for basic 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. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code. Section 181.006 states in relevant part:

[F]or a covered entity that is a governmental unit, an individual’s protected health information:

- (1) includes any information that reflects that an individual received health care from the covered entity; and
- (2) is not public information and is not subject to disclosure under [the Act].

Health & Safety Code § 181.006. Section 181.001(b)(2) defines “[c]overed entity,” in part, as:

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

[A]ny person who:

(A) for commercial, financial, or professional gain, monetary fees, or dues, or on a cooperative, nonprofit, or pro bono basis, engages, in whole or in part, and with real or constructive knowledge, in the practice of assembling, collecting, analyzing, using, evaluating, storing, or transmitting protected health information. The term includes a business associate, health care payer, governmental unit, information or computer management entity, school, health researcher, health care facility, clinic, health care provider, or person who maintains an Internet site[.]

Id. § 181.001(b)(2). We understand Parkland operates a hospital that maintains health information for the individuals it serves, including information showing that individuals received medical care from Parkland. Thus, you claim Parkland is a covered entity for the purposes of section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code. You assert the remaining information consists of protected health information. However, the information at issue is contained in records of the department, which is a law enforcement agency. You have not demonstrated how the department is a covered entity for purposes of section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is subject to section 181.006 of the Health and Safety Code. Accordingly, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 also encompasses section 241.152 of the Health and Safety Code, which states in relevant part:

(a) Except as authorized by Section 241.153, a hospital or an agent or employee of a hospital may not disclose health care information about a patient to any person other than the patient or the patient's legally authorized representative without the written authorization of the patient or the patient's legally authorized representative.

Id. § 241.152(a). Section 241.151(2) of the Health and Safety Code defines "health care information" as "information . . . recorded in any form or medium that identifies a patient and relates to the history, diagnosis, treatment, or prognosis of a patient." *Id.* § 241.151(2). In this instance, you do not explain how the information at issue identifies a patient and relates to the history, diagnosis, treatment, or prognosis of a patient. Thus, we find you have failed to establish that the remaining information is confidential under section 241.152 of the Health and Safety Code. Accordingly, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 on this basis.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation

with the agency[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, no writ); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined section 552.111 excepts only those internal communications that consist of advice, opinions, recommendations and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body’s policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *See id.*; *see also City of Garland v. The Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body’s policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body’s policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995). Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *See* ORD 615 at 5. But, if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

Section 552.111 can also encompass communications between a governmental body and a third-party, including a consultant or other party with a privity of interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 561 at 9 (1990) (section 552.111 encompasses communications with party with which governmental body has privity of interest or common deliberative process). For section 552.111 to apply, the governmental body must identify the third party and explain the nature of its relationship with the governmental body. Section 552.111 is not applicable to a communication between the governmental body and a third party unless the governmental body establishes it has a privity of interest or common deliberative process with the third party. *See id.*

Upon review, we find you have not explained, or otherwise demonstrated, how the submitted incident report constitutes internal advice, recommendations, or opinions regarding policymaking issues. Consequently, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.111 to any portion of the basic information, and that information may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.111.

In summary, with the exception of basic information, you may withhold the submitted information from disclosure under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/dls

Ref: ID# 480056

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 3 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Elizabeth Lutton
Legal Advisor
Dallas County Sheriff's Department
133 North Riverfront Boulevard, LB-31
Dallas, Texas 75207
(w/o enclosures)