Los Angeles County Bar Association Professional Responsibility and Ethics Committee



Attorney Office Files—Release of Client Psychiatric Records to Former Client

SUMMARY: Subject to the terms of any applicable court order, an attorney who has received mental health records of a client in the course of representing that client must release the mental health records to the former client following termination of the attorney-client relationship when requested by the former client to do so. The attorney does not have the discretion to refuse the request of the former client on the basis that the disclosure of the mental health records is not in the best interests of the former client or others.

AUTHORITIES CITED: Civil Code Sections 56, 1798-1798.78, 1798.40(f), 1798.41, and 1798.45-53; Health & Safety Code Sections 123100 d-123149; California Rules of Professional Conduct, Rule 3-700(D)(1); Santa Clara County Counsel Attys. Assoc. v. Woodside, 7 Cal. 4th 525 (1994); Blanton v. Womancare, 38 Cal. 3d 396, 406 (1985); Lee v. State Bar, 2 Cal. 3d 927, 939 (1970); People ex rel. Deukmejian v. Brown, 29 Cal. 3d 150, 157 (1981); People v. Stanley, 10 Cal. 4th 764, 804-05 (1995); People v. Masterson, 8 Cal. 4th 965 (1994); Rose v. State Bar, 49 Cal. 3d 646, 655 (1989); Shephard v. Superior Court, 180 Cal. App. 3d 23 (1986); Sullivan v. Duane, 198 C. 183, 192, 244 P. 343 (1926); State Comp. Ins. Fund v. WPS, Inc., 70 Cal. App. 4th 644 (1999); Stockton Theatres v. Palermo, 121 Cal. App. 2d 616 (1953); Tarasoff v. Regents of University of California, 17 Cal. 3d 425 (1976); Watchumna Water Co. v. Bailey, 216 Cal. 564, 571 (1932); Yorn v. Superior Court, 90 Cal. App. 3d 113, 116 (1979); State Bar Formal Opinion Nos. 2001-156, 1994-134 footnote 3, 1989-112, 1989-111, and 1987-93; Los Angeles County Bar Association, Professional Responsibility and Ethics Committee, Formal Opinion Nos. 459, 475, and 491; Restatement (Second) of Agency Section 1 and comment, Section 261.

STATEMENT OF FACTS: Attorney is a public defender¹ ("Attorney") who represents defendants in criminal prosecutions. In some cases, Attorney obtains mental health records of Attorney's clients to assist Attorney in defending them. A former client ("Former Client") has instructed Attorney to release to Former Client all mental health records of the Former Client obtained by Attorney in the course of Attorney's representation of the Former Client (the "mental health records").² The mental health records include a warning attached by the mental health care provider who transmitted the mental health records to Attorney that the records should not be provided to the Former Client as the records, in the opinion of the originating mental health care provider, contain information which if disclosed to the Former Client, could be detrimental to Former Client's mental health or treatment, or could put others in danger.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED: Must Attorney release the mental health records to Former Client as the Former Client has requested? May Attorney withhold those mental health records marked by the mental health provider with a restrictive warning not to disclose the records to Former Client? May Attorney take any action to interfere with Former Client's instructions, such as by bringing the matter to the attention of a court?

DISCUSSION

a. Attorney's Professional Responsibilities.

Rule 3-700 of the California Rules of Professional Conduct deals

explicitly with the duties of lawyers whose former clients request their files. Rule 3-700 states: "(D) A member whose employment has terminated shall: (1) Subject to any protective order or non-disclosure agreement, promptly release to the client, at the request of the client, all the client papers and property. 'Client papers and property' includes correspondence, pleadings, deposition transcripts, exhibits, physical evidence, expert's reports, and other items reasonably necessary to the client's representation, whether the client has paid for them or not...."3

Rule 3-700 recognizes that the documents and materials created or compiled by a lawyer during the course of a representation belong to the client, and not to the lawyer, and the lawyer has no legitimate interest in those materials except for the purpose of representing the client in conformity with the client's instructions. It therefore creates the general rule that an attorney is subject to professional discipline for failing to promptly release any client papers or property to the former client following a request for them by the former client.

Rule 3-700 does not by its terms authorize the lawyer to exercise any discretion to override the client's instructions to release. This is consistent with our model of the lawyerclient relationship: The lawyer is the agent of the client and is responsible for carrying out the client's lawful instructions on all substantive matters after the lawyer has utilized her training, skill, and experience to counsel the client.4

b. Mental Health Record Legislation

The California Legislature has enacted a comprehensive scheme to encourage and permit patient access to records of their medical condition and treatment, including mental health records. These provisions are found at California Health and Safety Code Sections 123100-123149.5.

Section 123100 states the general rule that each person is entitled to access to his or her own health care records. Section 123100 is based on an explicit legislative finding that "every person having ultimate responsibility for decisions respecting his or her own health care also possesses a concomitant right of access to complete information respecting his or her condition and care provided."5

In addition to the general right of a patient to obtain full information about his or her own health and health treatment, the legislative scheme gives the patient certain specific rights. For example, Section 123111(a) gives a patient who believes his or her health care records are incomplete or inaccurate the right to require that an addendum be attached to his or her records to complete or correct them.

The general rule is subject to two exceptions set forth in Section 123115 limiting patient access to their healthcare records. The first involves healthcare records of

minors and is not applicable to this inquiry. The second exception is contained in Section 123115(b), which provides:

When a health care provider determines that there is a substantial risk of significant adverse or detrimental consequences to a patient in seeing or receiving a copy of mental health records requested by the patient, the provider may decline to permit inspection or provide copies of the records to the patient, subject to the following conditions: (1) The health care provider shall make a written record, to be included with the mental health records requested, noting the date of the request and explaining the health care provider's reasons for refusing to permit inspection or provide copies of the records, including a description of the specific adverse consequences or detrimental consequences to the patient that the provider anticipates would occur if inspection or copying were permitted. (2) The health care provider shall permit inspection by, or provide copies of the mental health records to, a licensed physician and surgeon, licensed psychologist, licensed marriage and family therapist, or licensed clinical social worker, designated by request of the patient [who signs a receipt for the records acknowledging that he or she] shall not permit inspection or copying by the patient.

Thus, the healthcare provider is given the right in particular circumstances to prevent his or her patient's access to mental health records either by refusing to release them to the patient or by releasing them to other health care providers only when they have agreed not to release them to the patient. To the extent the records are maintained by a state agency, there is a similar statutory scheme that is part of the Information Practices Act at Civil Code Sections 1798.40(f), 1798.41, and 1798.45-53.

Neither of these statutory schemes grants to the healthcare provider any authority to limit the use or disclosure of mental health records by the patient's attorney, to whom the healthcare provider has given the records. Nor do these statutory schemes grant the patient's attorney any authority to limit the release of the mental health records, even if the attorney believes such action would be dangerous to his or her client or to

As a result, the written notice that the healthcare provider has placed on the file provided to Attorney appears to have no legal effect and, if not, the notice does not alter

Attorney's general duty under Rule 3-700. We recognize that the healthcare provider is authorized by Section 123113(b) to refuse to allow his or her patient to see the records if the healthcare provider determines that such disclosure would create "a substantial risk of significant adverse or detrimental consequences to [the] patient...."

If this had occurred, then Attorney, on behalf of her client, might have been able to object to the healthcare provider's decision not to release the mental health records under Section 123120. This section gives the patient a right of court action. We do not address the legal issue of whether this procedure might allow a court to limit the right of Attorney to release the mental health records, or portions of them. If a court had issued an order limiting Attorney's disclosure of the mental health records to Former Client, Attorney would have been obligated to comply with that order under Rule 3-700(D), which states that the duty to make client files available to the client is subject to any applicable protective order.

c. Former Patient's Possible Lack of Competence

The law recognizes that insane and incompetent clients do not have the same control over substantive issues possessed by other clients. For example, although the client normally controls all substantive decisions, it has been held that counsel may waive jury trial in an incompetency trial over the client's express objection and may urge the client's incompetency even though the client expressly directs that counsel argue that the client is competent. Shephard v. Superior Court, 180 Cal. App. 3d 23 (1986), approved in People v. Stanley, 10 Cal. 4th 764, 804-05 (1995) and People v. Masterson, 8 Cal. 4th 965 (1994).

The foregoing cases do not create any general rule allowing a lawyer to make substantive decisions on behalf of a client, and they do not state a specific rule that a lawyer may withhold a former client's mental health records from the former client based on the lawyer's opinion of the mental condition of the client.6

d. Does Attorney Have the Right to Seek Court Intervention to **Interfere with Former Client's Instructions to Attorney?**

In its Opinion 1989-112, the California State Bar Committee on Professional Responsibility and Conduct faced a similar issue: May an attorney institute conservatorship proceedings on a client's behalf, without the client's consent, where the attorney has concluded the client is incompetent to act in his best interest? That committee concluded this would be unethical for the attorney because, by doing so, the attorney would be divulging the client's secrets and representing either conflicting or adverse inter-

Our situation is not precisely the same as that in Cal. State Bar Opinion 1989-112 because here the attorney-client relationship between Attorney and Former Client already has ended. We therefore are dealing with Attorney's duties to a former client rather than a current client. Nevertheless, it is implicit in Opinion 1989-112 that the attorney could not terminate his attorney-client relationship with his client and then institute conservatorship proceedings against the client. We reach the same conclusion here.

"[T]he attorney-client relationship involves not just the casual assistance of a member of the bar, but an intimate process of consultation and planning which culminates in a state of trust and confidence between a client and his attorney." Cal. State Bar Opinion 1987-93. Because of the duties of confidentiality and undivided loyalty, an attorney may not use or disclose to the disadvantage of a former client any information obtained by the attorney in the course of that relationship, and an attorney may not act against a client in any matter in which the attorney formerly represented the client. Watchumna Water Co. v. Bailey, 216 Cal. 564, 571 (1932); Yorn v. Superior Court, 90 Cal. App. 3d 113, 116 (1979); and Stockton Theatres v. Palermo, 121 Cal. App. 2d 616.7

This opinion is advisory only. The committee acts on specific questions submitted ex parte and its opinions are based only on such facts as are set forth in the questions submitted.

- 1 Although the inquiry is from an attorney employed by a governmental entity in connection with a criminal matter, the issues raised are not distinguishable from the duties owed by private counsel or in civil matters. As a general principle, the duties of lawyers are the same for lawyers who are and are not employed by governmental entities. Santa Clara County Counsel Attys. Assoc. v. Woodside, 7 Cal. 4th 525 (1994); People ex rel. Deukmejian v. Brown, 29 Cal. 3d 150, 157 (1981); Cal. State Bar Op. 2001-156; L.A. County Bar Ass'n Formal
- $^{\scriptscriptstyle 2}$ We adopt the definition of Health & Safety Code §123105(b): "Mental health records' means patient records, or discrete portions thereof, specifically relating to evaluation or treatment of a mental disorder. 'Mental health records' includes, but is not limited to, all alcohol and drug abuse records."
- 3 For a list of advisory ethics opinions that discuss what must be released to the client under Rule 3-700 as being part of the client file, see L.A. County Bar Ass'n Formal Opinion 491 n.2 (1997). We conclude that mental health records of a client obtained by the client's attorney are part of the attorney's client file for purposes of Rule 3-700. In Formal Opinion 475 this committee stated that the "file belongs to the client. Further the

client may, for reasons known or unknown to the lawyer, find something of significant economic or personal value in the file even after the case is over....[There is] an ethical obligation to try to return the files to the former clients or to try to obtain authorization to destroy the files." Absent an issue as to the potential danger to the client or others from releasing some or all of the mental health records to Former Client the records must be released to the client in compliance with Rule 3-700(D) (1) (see Rose v. State Bar. 49 Cal. 3d 646, 655 (1989); State Bar Formal Opinion No. 1994-134).

- Whether employee or independent contractor, an attorney will usually be the agent of the client in transactions in which the attorney acts for the client. Sullivan v. Duane, 198 C. 183, 192, 244 P. 343 (1926); RESTATE-MENT (SECOND) OF AGENCY §1 & cmt., §261; Blanton v. Womancare, 38 Cal. 3d 396, 406 (1985); State Bar Formal Op. 1989-111.
- ⁵ Consistent with this legislative scheme, we assume that Attorney's Former Client has the legal right to control his or her own healthcare decisions. We do not examine the legal issue of when or how a person might lose that right or what duties Attorney might have in that situation.
- 6 As stated in n.5, we assume Former Client has the legal right to make his or her own healthcare decisions.
- 7 To the extent Former Client poses an actual or apparent threat to the safety of others, this opinion is not intended to reach the possible application of the "duty to warn" the California Supreme Court imposed on psychotherapists in Tarasoff v. Regents of Univ. of Cal., 17 Cal. 3d 425 (1976). The committee also recognizes the possible argument that the case of State Comp. Ins. Fund v. WPS, Inc., 70 Cal. App. 4th 644 (1999), may be instructive in our situation. In that case the court held that:

[T]he obligation of an attorney receiving privileged documents due to the inadvertence of another is as follows: When a lawyer who receives materials that obviously appear to be subject to an attorney-client privilege or otherwise clearly appear to be confidential and privileged and where it is reasonably apparent that the materials were provided or made available through inadvertence, the lawyer receiving such materials should refrain from examining the materials any more than is essential to ascertain if the materials are privileged, and shall immediately notify the sender that he or she possesses material that appears to be privileged. The parties may then proceed to resolve the situation by agreement or may resort to the court for guidance with the benefit of protective orders and other judicial intervention as may be justified. We do, however, hold that whenever a lawyer ascertains that he or she may have privileged attorneyclient material that was inadvertently provided by another, that lawyer must notify the party entitled to the privilege of that fact.

The committee notes that the mental health records at issue here are not protected by the attorney-client privilege of an adverse party and have by statute been vested with a preference for disclosure to the client. The committee is not aware of any authority extending State Comp. Ins. Fund v. WPS, Inc., to impose an ethical duty upon Attorney, upon receipt of the marked mental health records or any time thereafter, to notify the healthcare provider of the apparent inadvertent disclosure and "resort to the court for guidance with the benefit of protective orders and other judicial intervention as may be justified." The committee declines to express an opinion as to whether or not State Comp. Ins. Fund v. WPS, Inc., would be so extended.

Enhancing lives one smile at a time.TM

- Perhaps a smile enhancement program with Dr. Jack Semmens could benefit your professional image, career, or more importantly, your self-esteem?
- Do you feel that your professional image could enhance your earnings?
- Is your career stalled and in need of a push forward?
- Is your self-esteem worth the investment that cosmetic dentistry could provide you

The first step in your new smile is to call for your evaluation. Call Dr. Semmens today. You will be pleased and excited that you did!

JACK L. SEMMENS, DDS DENTAL CORPORATION

495 NORTH LAKE BLVD., SUITE 270 P.O. BOX 1912, TAHOE CITY, CA 96145

(530)-583-5546 1(866) 831-9394 Toll Free

www.jacksemmens.com

ACCIDENT

A no-cost call can help you decide EXACTLY WHAT YOU NEED! If we can't help you, we will refer you to the BEST in accident investigation and reconstruction.



Traffic/Transportation Engineer

Over 35 years of Practical Experience

"Millions" in Litigation Defense and Recovery (100's OF DEFENSE AND PLAINTIFF CASES)

FIELD & TEST ENGINEERING, INC.

(562) 743-7230 FAX (562) 920-9204

ON CIVIC CENTER DRIVE

(9837 Belmont Street) Bellflower, CA 90706