



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 24, 2016

Ms. Tanya E. Pino  
Assistant County Attorney  
Montgomery County  
501 North Thompson, Suite 300  
Conroe, Texas 77301

OR2016-11863

Dear Ms. Pino:

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# 611647 (Montgomery Co. ORR # 16PIA149).

The Montgomery County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office") received a request for a specified case file. You state you have released some information. 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.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information consists of grand jury subpoenas and information obtained pursuant to grand jury subpoenas. The judiciary is expressly excluded from the requirements of the Act. Gov't Code § 552.003(1)(B). This office has determined for purposes of the Act, a grand jury is a part of the judiciary and therefore not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 411 (1984). Further, records kept by a governmental body that is acting as an agent for a grand jury are considered records in the constructive possession of the grand jury, and are also not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 513 (1988), 411, 398 (1983). Thus, to the extent the sheriff's office holds the information at issue as an agent of the grand jury, such information consists of records of the judiciary that are not subject to disclosure under the Act and the sheriff's office is not required to release that information in response to the instant request. To the extent the sheriff's office does not hold the information at issue as an agent of the grand jury, we will address the sheriff's office's argument against its disclosure.

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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as the Medical Practice Act (the “MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which provides in pertinent part, the following:

(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 that is subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This office has determined 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. As such, the sheriff’s office must withhold the marked medical records under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. However, we find none of the remaining information constitutes confidential medical records for the purposes of the MPA; thus, the sheriff’s office may not withhold any of the remaining information on this 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). 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. *Id.* 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.<sup>1</sup> *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. We note the requestor has a right of access to her own date of birth pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Thus, the sheriff's office must withhold the public citizen's date of birth we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the remaining information is either not highly intimate or embarrassing or is of legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the sheriff's office may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

In summary, to the extent the sheriff's office holds the information at issue as an agent of the grand jury, such information consists of records of the judiciary that are not subject to disclosure under the Act and the sheriff's office is not required to release that information in response to the instant request. The sheriff's office must withhold the marked medical records under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The sheriff's office must withhold the public citizen's date of birth we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information must be released.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 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).

<sup>2</sup>We note the information being released in this instance includes information that is confidential with respect to the general public. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a), ORD 481 at 4. Therefore, if the sheriff's office receives another request for this information from a different requestor, the sheriff's office must again seek a ruling from this office.

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](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,



Matthew Taylor  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MHT/dls

Ref: ID# 611647

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)