



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 7, 2015

Ms. Josette Flores
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of El Paso
P.O. Box 1890
El Paso, Texas 79950-1890

OR2015-21059

Dear Ms. Flores:

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# 582177 (File No. 15-1006-522).

The City of El Paso (the "city") received a request for the findings of a specified investigation. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exception 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. The city raises section 552.101 in conjunction with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("HIPAA") for some 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* HIPAA, 42 U.S.C. § 1320d-2 (Supp. IV 1998) (historical & statutory note); Standards

¹Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy, you have not submitted arguments explaining how this doctrine is applicable to the submitted information. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn this claim. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

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 has addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004). In that decision, we noted section 164.512 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations provides a covered entity may use or disclose protected health information to the extent 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 the Act “is a mandate in Texas law that compels Texas governmental bodies to disclose information to the public.” *See* ORD 681 at 8; *see also* Gov’t Code §§ 552.002, .003, .021. We therefore held 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 not withhold any portion of the submitted information on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) A communication between certified emergency medical services personnel or a physician providing medical supervision and a patient that is made in the course of providing emergency medical services to the patient is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(b) Records of the identity, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by emergency medical services personnel or by a physician providing medical supervision that are created by the emergency medical services personnel or physician or maintained by an emergency medical services provider are confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

...

(g) The privilege of confidentiality under this section does not extend to information regarding the presence, nature of injury or illness, age, sex,

occupation, and city of residence of a patient who is receiving emergency medical services.

Health & Safety Code § 773.091(a)-(b), (g). Upon review, we find section 773.091 is applicable to portions of the submitted information. Thus, with the exception of the information subject to section 773.091(g), which is not confidential under section 773.091, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091(b) of the Health and Safety Code. However, we find the remaining information does not consist a record of the identity, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by emergency medical services. Therefore, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091(b) of the Health and Safety Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) 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 satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered highly intimate or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987).

Upon review, the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. In this instance, however, the requestor is the spouse of the individual whose privacy interests are at issue. Thus, the requestor may be the authorized representative of that individual, and may have a right of access to information pertaining to his spouse that would otherwise be confidential under common-law privacy. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) ("person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests"); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Accordingly, if the requestor is acting as the authorized representative of his spouse, then the city may not withhold any portion of the marked information from this requestor under section 552.101 on the basis of common-law privacy. If the requestor is not acting as the authorized representative of his spouse, then the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, with the exception of the information subject to section 773.091(g), which is not confidential under section 773.091, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091(b) of the Health and Safety Code. If the requestor is not acting as the authorized representative of his spouse, then the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Cole Hutchison
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CH/som

Ref: ID# 582177

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)