



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 4, 2016

Ms. Elaine Nicholson
Assistant City Attorney
Law Department
City of Austin
P.O. Box 1088
Austin, Texas 78767-8828

OR2016-07420

Dear Ms. Nicholson:

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# 604220.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for a specified investigation file pertaining to a named individual. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

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 the Medical Practices Act

¹We note, and you acknowledge, the city did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Nevertheless, because section 552.101 of the Government Code is a mandatory exception that can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness caused by a failure to comply with section 552.301, we will consider the city's claim under section 552.101. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302.

²We 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

(the “MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in part, as follows:

(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).* We have also found that when a file is created as the result of a hospital stay, all the documents in the file relating to diagnosis and treatment constitute physician-patient communications or “[r]ecords of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that are created or maintained by a physician.” *Open Records Decision No. 546 (1990).* Upon review, we find the information we have marked constitutes medical records or information obtained from medical records. Accordingly, the city must withhold the marked information under section 552.101 in conjunction with the MPA.³ However, we find the remaining information does not consist of records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that were created or maintained by a physician, or someone under the supervision of a physician. Therefore, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld 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 established. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial*

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

Foundation. Id. at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). This office has also found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (finding personal financial information to include designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits and optional insurance coverage; choice of particular insurance carrier; direct deposit authorization; and forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care, or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern. Accordingly, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. 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/bhf

Ref: ID# 604220

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)