



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 28, 2016

Mr. Ryan D. Pittman
Counsel for the City of Frisco
Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Hullett, P.C.
P.O. Box 1210
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2016-02141

Dear Mr. Pittman:

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# 596037 (Frisco reference #G007569-102815).

The City of Frisco (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for medical and billing records pertaining to a specified incident involving a named individual. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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

(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(b), (g). Except for the information specified in section 773.091(g), emergency medical services (“EMS”) records are deemed confidential under section 773.091. Upon review, we find the information we have marked constitutes records of the identity, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by EMS personnel. Thus, except for the information subject to section 773.091(g), 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.¹ However, we find the remaining information does not constitute records of the identity, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by EMS personnel. Therefore, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

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 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). In this instance, you seek to withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the requestor is the authorized representative to whom the remaining information pertains. *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 herself). Thus, the requestor has a right of access to any remaining information pertaining to the individual that would otherwise be confidential under common-law privacy. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue from this requestor under section 552.101 on the basis of common-law privacy.

In summary, with the exception of the information subject to section 773.091(g), which must be released, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091(b) of the Health and Safety Code. The city must release the remaining information.²

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,



Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/dls

Ref: ID# 596037

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

²This ruling does not affect an individual's right of access to a patient's EMS records from the EMS provider. See Health & Safety Code §§ 773.092, .093; cf. *Abbott v. Tex. State Bd. of Pharmacy*, 391 S.W.3d 253 (Tex. App.—Austin 2012, no pet.) (Medical Practice Act does not provide patient general right of access to his or her medical records from governmental body responding to request for information under Public Information Act). We also note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Thus, the city must again seek a decision from this office if it receives another request for the same information from another requestor.