



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 13, 2015

Ms. Sylvia McClellan
Assistant City Attorney
Criminal Law and Police Section
City of Dallas
1400 South Lamar Street
Dallas, Texas 75215

OR2015-23874

Dear Ms. McClellan:

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# 587081 (DPD Request No. 2015-14057).

The Dallas Police Department (the "department") received a request for a specified case report involving the requestor. We understand the department is redacting motor vehicle information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code,¹ e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code in accordance with Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009),² and the originating telephone number of a 9-1-1 caller pursuant to the previous determination issued in Open Records Letter No. 2011-17075 (2011).³ The department claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under

¹We note section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e).

²Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* ORD 684.

³Open Records Letter No. 2011-17075 is a previous determination issued to the city's police department authorizing it to withhold, without requesting a decision from this office, the originating telephone numbers of 9-1-1 callers furnished by a service supplier established in accordance with chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code.

section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the department claims 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. Section 552.101 encompasses information made confidential by statute, such as the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant 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)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This office has concluded 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 find the information we have marked constitutes records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that were created or are maintained by a physician. Accordingly, the department must withhold the marked medical records under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.⁴

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 intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial*

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the department’s remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 682. In considering whether a public citizen's date of birth is private, the Third Court of Appeals looked to the supreme court's rationale in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of Texas*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). The supreme court concluded public employees' dates of birth are private under section 552.102 of the Government Code because the employees' privacy interest substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in disclosure.⁵ *Texas Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Texas Comptroller*, the court of appeals concluded the privacy rights of public employees apply equally to public citizens, and thus, public citizens' dates of birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3.

Upon review, we find the information we have marked and indicated satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the department has failed to demonstrate the remaining information it has marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the department may not withhold the remaining information it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the department must withhold the medical records we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA and the information we have marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must release the remaining information.⁶

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.

⁵Section 552.102(a) exempts 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).

⁶We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates, or that party's representative, solely on grounds that information is considered confidential by privacy principles). Because such information is confidential with respect to the general public, if the department receives another request for this information from a different requestor, then the department should again seek a ruling from this office.

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,



David L. Wheelus
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DLW/bhf

Ref: ID# 587081

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)