

## CONFIDENTIALITY OF TREATMENT RECORDS

### THE LAW

#### **Confidentiality:**

Each patient shall..."Have the right to **confidentiality of all treatment records...**"

§ 51.61(1)(n), Wis. Stats. [Emphasis added.]

#### **Access to Records by Persons Other Than the Patient:**

" *Confidentiality of records.* Except as otherwise provided in this chapter and ss. 118.125(4), 610.70(3) and (5), 905.03 and 905.04, all treatment records shall remain confidential and are **privileged to the subject individual**. Such **records may be released only to the persons designated in this chapter** or ss. 118.125(4), 610.70(3) and (5), 905.03 and 905.04, or to **other designated persons with the informed written consent** of the subject individual as provided in this section..."

§ 51.30(4)(a), Wis. Stats. [Emphasis added.]

[NOTE: There follows in sec. 51.30(4)(b) a list of **31 exceptions** to the requirement for written informed consent, as well as special limitations on access to drug and alcohol treatment records.]

"*Destruction, damage, falsification or concealment of treatment records.* **No person** may do **any** of the **following**:

1. Intentionally **falsify** a treatment record.
2. **Conceal** or **withhold** a treatment record with **intent** to **prevent** its **release** to the subject individual under par. (d), to his or her guardian or to persons with the informed written consent of the subject individual **or** with **intent** to **prevent** or **obstruct** an **investigation** or **prosecution**.
3. **Intentionally destroy** or **damage** records in order to **prevent** or **obstruct** an **investigation** or **prosecution**." § 51.30(4)(dm) Wis. Stats. [Emphasis added.]

" GRIEVANCES. **Failure to comply** with any provisions of this section may be **processed as a grievance** under s. 51.61(5), except that a grievance resolution procedure option made available to the patient, as required under s. 457.04(8), applies to failures to comply by a licensed mental health professional who is not affiliated with a county department or treatment facility. However, use of the grievance procedure is **not required before bringing any civil action** or filing a criminal complaint under this section.

§ 51.30(8), Wis. Stats. [Emphasis added.]

"ACTIONS FOR VIOLATIONS: DAMAGES: INJUNCTION. (a) **Any person**, including the state or any political subdivision of the state, **violating this section** shall be **liable** to any person damaged as a result of the violation for such damages as may be proved,

together with **exemplary damages of not more than \$1,000** for each violation and such **costs and reasonable actual attorney fees** as may be incurred by the person damaged.

(b) In any action brought under par. (a) in which the court determines that the violator acted in a manner that was **knowing and willful**, the violator shall be liable for such **damages** as may be proved together with **exemplary damages of not more than \$25,000** for each violation, together with **costs and reasonable actual attorney fees** as may be incurred. It is not a prerequisite to an action under this subsection that the plaintiff suffer or be threatened with actual damages.

(c) An individual **may bring an action to enjoin any violation** of this section or to compel compliance with this section, and may in the same action **seek damages** as provided in this subsection. The individual may recover **costs and reasonable actual attorney fees** as may be incurred in the action, if he or she prevails."

§ 51.30(9), Wis. Stats. [Emphasis added.]

"PENALTIES: (a) Whoever does any of the following may be **fined** not more than **\$25,000** or **imprisoned** for not more than **9 months**, or **both**:

1. **Requests** or obtains confidential information under this section **under false pretenses**.
2. **Discloses** confidential information under this section with the knowledge that the disclosure is unlawful and not reasonably necessary to protect another from harm.
3. Violates sub. (4)(dm)1., 2. or 3. [*Destruction, damage, falsification or concealment of treatment records.*]

(b) Whoever **negligently** discloses confidential information under this section is subject to a forfeiture of not more than \$1,000 for each violation.

(bm) Whoever **intentionally** discloses confidential information under this section, knowing the information is confidential, and discloses the information for **pecuniary gain** may be **fined** not more than **\$100,000** or **imprisoned** not more than **3 years and 6 months**, or **both**."

§ 51.30(10), Wis. Stats.

[Emphasis added.]

"DISCIPLINE OF EMPLOYEES. **Any employee** of the department, a county department under s. 51.42 or 51.437 or a public treatment facility **who violates this section** or any rule promulgated pursuant to this section may be subject to **discharge or suspension without pay**."

§ 51.30(11), Wis. Stats.

[Emphasis added.]

[NOTE: The above includes **only a portion of sec. 51.30**, Stats., which should be read in its entirety by anyone handling patient records.]

---

" EMPLOYEE ORIENTATION. Directors and program directors shall ensure that persons whose regular duties include requesting, distributing, or granting access to treatment records are **aware of their responsibility to maintain the confidentiality** of information protected by this chapter and of the criminal and civil liabilities for violations of s. 51.30, Stats. DHS 92.11, Wis. Admin. Code [Emphasis added.]

[FURTHER NOTE: See also full **Chapter DHS 92**, Wis. Admin. Code, which codifies Sec. 51.30, Wis. Stats.]

[NOTE: The federal Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (**HIPAA**) took effect on **February 14, 2003**. Any questions involving confidentiality of treatment records should be reviewed by the facility's HIPAA **Privacy Officer**.]

[Note: See also the **Records Access** and **Records Corrections** sections of this digest.]

---

## DECISIONS

1. A hospital had a **release of information** allowing them to share information about the patient's care **with her family**. However, **they released records** to the family that the **patient did not want released**. The **hospital acknowledged** they had exceeded the scope of the release of information they had and **implemented a procedure** to ensure that this **error did not occur again**. **Nothing can undo the error**, but the hospital's **actions were the proper remedy** under the circumstances. That is all the grievance process can do. The **patient could still take the hospital to court if she wished**. This matter was considered resolved. (Level III decision in Case No. 97-SGE-01 on 5/27/97)
2. Subsection 51.30(4)(b)5 allows **access without consent** "...to qualified staff members of the department... as is necessary to determine progress and adequacy of treatment..." Thus the **State Grievance Examiner** is allowed to **obtain otherwise confidential records** without the informed consent of the complainant. (Level IV decision in Case No. 98-SGE-02 on 1/22/99.)
3. A **methadone clinic** involved **17 different staff** members in a **multi-disciplinary team** meeting to discuss a patient's alleged dose-splitting. This team meeting **included staff** who had **no involvement** with the patient and had **no "need to know"** the treatment information about this client. The patient provided no release of information. This process **violated the patient's right to confidentiality** of his treatment information. (Level III decision in Case No. 99-SGE-02 on 5/17/00. Appeal to Level IV by the patient was dismissed since the Level III decision was in his favor.)

4. A patient **claimed a breach of confidentiality** by her therapist in a phone conversation with her mother. It was found that the **mother initiated the call** because of her concerns for her daughter and that the **therapist was careful not to divulge** any information about the daughter's treatment. The mother asked the therapist not to tell the daughter about the phone call. The therapist could not promise that she would not divulge that the mother called, but eventually decided not to inform the daughter. Her reasons for making that decision were documented. **No breach** of the daughter's **confidentiality** was found. (Level III decision in Case No. 00-SGE-02 on 6/17/00, upheld at Level IV.)
5. A client received services from an agency contracted by the county. He felt that the **provider releasing information, without his consent**, to an **evaluator** who was completing a vocational assessment **violated his confidentiality**. The evaluator was from a local university who had no official connection to the county's service delivery system. However, by mutual agreement all the parties, including the client, he was to do a comprehensive vocational evaluation the client. At a later meeting with the parties, the client found out that county staff had shared specific information about his mental health history but had not obtained a release from him to do so. Other "consents to disclose confidential information" were on file, but there was **no release** of information relative to the staff's involvement in the evaluation process. Was the verbal sharing of any information with the evaluator was permissible? Any information about the client's mental health history and treatment would constitute "treatment record" information within the meaning of confidentiality laws. But the staff's very presence at the meeting was an identification of sorts that the client was receiving services from the county. Did the presence of the staff at the meeting and the client's lack of objection at the time to any information shared provide an implied consent on his part? Was any information shared covered by some other exception to the requirement for an informed written consent? It was concluded that this evaluation was akin to a "second consultation" and not provided as a routine "purchase of service" resource for county staff. Thus, it did not readily fit into one of the exceptions to the confidentiality law wherein there would be a pre-existing purchase of services contract between the county and a provider. Further, the section of DHS 94 that addresses a "second consultation" notes that the person doing the consultation can review the client's treatment record. By the **staff member's un-objected-to presence**, the client may have provided an **implied consent**, but that this was a "**close call**" in terms of the technical confidentiality requirements. Since the vocational evaluation was set up by mutual agreement of all parties, there likely was an expectation of open sharing of treatment information to assist the evaluation process. Nonetheless, it would have been **best practice** for the service providers to have a **clearly written release of information** from the client that would specify who all could be part of the information sharing process. There was insufficient evidence to find a rights violation. When **outside evaluations** occur, there should be **clear documentation** of the evaluator's legal status in terms of that person's right to access treatment information. For example, is it being done under a purchase of services agreement, as a second opinion/ consultation, or via a

specific release of information that clarifies who can provide treatment information, and what type, to the evaluator. (Level III decision in Case No. 00-SGE-01 on 6/29/01.)

6. Generally, **information** from a patient's treatment records **cannot be released** without the client's **written informed consent**. But there are **exceptions** to confidentiality laws allowing for release of information without a patient's consent. One such exception stems from a 1988 Wisconsin Supreme Court decision in the **Schuster** case. In that case, the Wisconsin Supreme Court said that mental health therapists had a "**duty to warn**" any person who may be the specific target of a threat of harm. The patient was angry with a particular person and expressed that anger to his therapist. He did not think that he had specifically threatened to harm that person. However, if anger is expressed in a way that is assessed as threatening toward another person, there is little choice on the part of a mental health therapist but to share that information with a person who may be the target of potential harm. In this situation the **threat** was **passed on**, but no other treatment information was shared. That **disclosure** was **not a violation** of the client's right to confidentiality of his records. (Level III decision in Case No. 00-SGE-12 on 8/6/01.)
7. A patient, who had complained about her therapist and physician, expressed concerns about the **confidentiality** of her involvement in the **grievance procedure** and any follow-through that had occurred with her provider. She alleged that the entire staff of the service provider knew about her complaints. The director of the service provider noted that the record keeping system for grievances was entirely separate and that **only staff with a "need to know"** are **given access** to or information about the filing of grievances. Only a select group of management and treatment staff were aware of this patient's grievances and information about them was not available to others. It was found that the **confidentiality** of this grievance **was honored** and no rights violation occurred. (Level III decision in Case No. 00-SGE-03 on 9/12/01.)
8. A patient wanted to **bring a friend** to her **therapy sessions**. The service provider agreed that there are times that it may be appropriate, especially if the person is a primary support person for the client. Bringing another person to a therapy session **requires a signed release** from the patient. Since the requested remedy was provided, this issue was considered resolved. (Level III decision in Case No. 00-SGE-03 on 9/12/01.)
9. A patient complained that his **therapist** allegedly **asked him if his wife was having an affair**. He **responded** that **he would kill her and her boyfriend**. He also threatened to kill the therapist. The therapist discussed this with her supervisor and was instructed that she **had a duty to warn the wife of the threat**. The therapist informed the wife and the police. When the police questioned the husband, he threatened to harm them, too. These threats led to his emergency detention. The therapist's actions were appropriate under the circumstances. She **did have a duty to warn** where **threats were made about immediate harm to specific people**.

(Level III decision in Case No. 01-SGE-06 on 10/18/01.)

10. A service recipient asked a **temporary receptionist** for a grievance form. The temp **asked other staff** where the **complaint forms** were. The case manager heard about the request and asked the individual to come to her office to discuss her concerns. The grievance she wanted to file, however, was about her case manager. There was no evidence that anyone tried to talk her out of filing a complaint, nor any indication of reprisal, retaliation or discrimination because of her grievance. There was no violation of her right to file a complaint. The **temp** asking other staff where the grievance forms were **did not violate her right to confidentiality**. (Level III decision in Case No. 01-SGE-05 on 11/29/01.)
11. A patient's mother complained that her **daughter's doctor** violated her daughter's confidentiality. The Level I Client Rights Specialist did not address this issue in his written response. The **failure to address** this issue was a **violation of the right** to have the **grievance fully investigated**. (Level III decision in Case No. 01-SGE-02 on 12/10/01.)
12. A patient's mother complained that her daughter's doctor violated her daughter's confidentiality by **reading things from her records** during a **meeting** between the doctor, the **patient and her parents**. The parents had the **same right of access** to her records **as the daughter** had under §51.30(5)(b), Stats. Therefore there was **no violation** of confidentiality. (Level III decision in Case No. 01-SGE-02 on 12/10/01.)
13. The law states that, "A **patient** or a **person acting on behalf of a patient**" may **file a complaint**. It was a violation of the complainant's rights when a Level I Client Rights Specialist **refused to investigate** her allegation that her **ex-husband's right** to confidentiality **had been violated**. (Level III decision in Case No. 01-SGE-02 on 12/10/01.)
14. A **therapist informed a woman** that her **former husband was in counseling**. She had been unaware of that. The **disclosure violated** her ex-husband's **right to confidentiality**. (Level III decision in Case No. 01-SGE-02 on 12/10/01.)
15. Patients have the **right to involve their spouses** in their **home-visit treatment sessions** unless their participation is contraindicated for treatment reasons. The service provider should either allow such participation or explain to the patient why it is contraindicated. The patient would have to **sign a release of information** to allow the **spouse to be present** during treatment sessions. (Level III decision in Case No. 01-SGE-09 on 3/27/02.)
16. Sec. 51.30(4)(e), Stats., **requires** that, when **records are released**, "a **notation** shall be made in the records by the custodian thereof that includes the following: the name of the person to whom the information is released; the identification of the information released; the purpose of the release; and the date of the release".

**Handwritten notes in the margin** of records request documents, due to their brief nature, are **unlikely** to satisfy all the requirements of this statute. Subsequent to April 14, 2003, entities releasing records must also comply with the even more stringent federal Health Information Portability and Accountability Act (**HIPAA**). (Level IV decision in Case No. 02-SGE-04 on 9/19/03, overturning the Level III.)

17. A mother believed a **therapist acted unprofessionally** in working with her daughter by **not reporting** various **risky behaviors** in which her daughter was engaged. The therapist was aware that her daughter tried to commit suicide, purposely cut herself many times, used illegal drugs, and engaged in underage sex with multiple partners. The mother thought the therapist should have reported all these incidents to proper authorities. She requested disciplining the therapist – including possible license revocation. The records indicated that the suicidal ideation expressed by the daughter was taken seriously. Appropriate referral resources were immediately offered to her parents. The daughter was also placed on a medication for depression. For the next seven subsequent sessions the therapist inquired about and documented the daughter's present mental status and thoughts of suicide or dying. Each entry includes some statement indicating that she was asked if she was seriously contemplating suicide or hurting herself. She responded that she was not having thoughts about suicide or hurting herself over the following months. Therefore, her right to prompt and adequate treatment was met. The therapist was **not obligated** to initiate social services **intervention** into her family life, **or to notify any other authorities**. (Level III Decision in Case No. 03-SGE-02 on 12/26/03.)
18. A mother complained that her **daughter's therapist reported sexual abuse** to the county **social worker**. The therapist learned that a teacher at her daughter's home school had touched the young woman inappropriately. The therapist reported the allegations to the county social worker. The county Social Services department then got the **police involved**. The police came to the home school to arrest the teacher. This situation was stressful for both mother and daughter. The incident met the legal definition of **sexual abuse**. Since she was a **minor**, law **mandates** the **reporting** of the allegation. The therapist's actions were professional and appropriate. (Level III Decision in Case No. 03-SGE-02 on 12/26/03.)
19. There is legal precedence for the "**duty to warn** or protect," though in Wisconsin it is not defined by statute. The precedent is from the courts, and is outlined in the 1988 Wisconsin Supreme Court case **Schuster v. Altenberg**, and in subsequent literature. This case, similar to many that preceded it, establishes a **duty** on the part of **psychotherapists** to take "some **reasonable**" **action** to prevent **foreseeable harm** to third parties who are injured by those being treated by the psychotherapists. This state precedent parallels federal precedent, **Tarasoff v. Regents of the University of California**, which was a 1976 California case decided by the U.S. Supreme Court. (Level III Decision in Case No. 03-SGE-02 on 12/26/03.) [Note: In a 2010 decision, the Wisconsin Court of Appeals for District 1 held that, while there may be a "duty to warn", it **does not create an exception** to the confidentiality statutes allowing for release of **written records**. *Milwaukee Deputy Sheriff's Association, et al v. City of*

*Wauwatosa, 2010 W. App 95 (2010)]*

20. A mother was concerned about the way her **daughter's underage sexual activity** was handled in treatment. The therapist learned she had engaged in sexual activity with multiple partners. While it is true that a minor cannot legally consent to sexual activity, the relationships the minor was engaged in were not against her will, the relationships were with other minors who she was dating, and thus were not considered to be abuse. There was thus **no cause to violate the daughter's confidentiality** by reporting this matter to outside authorities. (Level III Decision in Case No. 03-SGE-02 on 12/26/03.)
21. A form called "**Consent for Release of Information – Patient Assistance Program**" is used by a service provider and is presented to all patients who **receive medications** through the Patient Assistance Program. This form is to aid patients in filling out the paperwork necessary to receive medications through the Patient Assistance Programs offered by pharmaceutical companies. The release allows service provider staff to help patients fill out all the information required on the application, and it allows staff to send the applications to the pharmaceutical companies (or their contracted agencies) for the patients. Without this consent, patients would need to fill out and mail the application form themselves. This is not possible in its entirety, as their physicians prescribing number is not available to be known by patients and must come from the service provider. **If a patient refuses to sign** this consent form, the individual **may not be denied services** by the provider, and patients may elect to fill out and send the application to the Patient Assistance Program on their own. In this case, the service recipient chose not to sign the release, and this did not negatively effect his treatment because he was able to handle the paperwork himself. This resolved the concern as it applied to him. However, he expressed concern about the form for other patients' confidentiality. Over 700 patients receive medications from this provider and approximately 75% of those patients receive their medications through a Patient Assistance Program, which resulted in over \$300,000 worth of medications being disbursed to patients at no cost to them in the last year through that agency. **Many of these clients do need assistance** in filling out the paperwork to maintain these free medication services. It was determined that the **consent form** in question is a **useful and important tool** for those individuals to maintain their psychiatric treatment services. While this person's concern for their confidentiality is admirable, the allegation that this form violates their confidentiality is unfounded, and the limitations on the types of information that can be released does protect patients' confidentiality and allows the provider to facilitate their clients' participation in the PAP. (Level III Decision in Case No. 03-SGE-08 on 7/14/04.)
22. The **confidentiality rights** of a client at a methadone clinic were **violated** when she was **called by her first and last name in the waiting room**. The appropriate and professional way to address her would be to only use her first name when other clients are present. The clinic remedied this confidentiality breach by conducting a staff In-service on confidentiality. (Level III decision in Case No. 04-SGE-02 on 12/20/04)



23. In order to **protect** a client's **confidentiality**, it is **not appropriate** to **discuss** confidential or personal matters **on a speakerphone** in a **cubicle workplace environment**. Speakerphone use during conference calls should be restricted to constructed office space or conference rooms that offer reasonable degrees of privacy. Here, the speakerphone use in question was appropriately conducted in a constructed office with a closed door. (Level III Grievance Decision in Case No. 04-SGE-07, affirmed at Level IV on 8/15/05)
24. If a county is **contracting with a mental health center** to provide inpatient treatment for a client, **they can share confidential client information** they have with the center **without the client's consent**. It did not violate the client's confidentiality here where the information shared was something the client had objected to as being inaccurate. The client had other means of trying to correct the information at issue. (Level III Grievance Decision in Case No. 04-SGE-07, affirmed at Level IV on 8/15/05)
25. A county **case manager disclosed information** about complainant to the Wisconsin **Department of Transportation (DOT)** via a "Driver Condition or Behavior Report" (DOT form MV 3141). The information disclosed on the DOT form **included his diagnosis and a summary of concerns and observations about his safety as a driver**. The disclosure of confidential treatment information to the DOT without his written informed consent was made **under the "duty to warn"**. Given the extensive records and documentation, legal precedents for the "duty to warn," and the county's HIPAA Policy Manual on this topic, it was concluded that the disclosure did not violate his right to confidentiality. Rather, it was a **valid exercise of professional judgment**. (Level III Decision in Case No. 08-SGE-10 on 1/9/09)
26. When there is a **disclosure of information about a client from the client's friends, family, or other persons** in the community to a therapist or other treatment provider, it is **appropriate for the mental health professionals to neither confirm nor deny the client's involvement in services**. However, it is generally acceptable for a treatment provider to listen to and/or read any information that is provided to them about a client, so long as they do not confirm or deny that person's participation in treatment. (Level III decision in Case No. 08-SGE-12 on 6/29/09)
27. If a client's **father** were to **ask his daughter's therapist general questions** based on his own observations and concerns, **and get general feedback** about what the therapist believes would be appropriate mental health recommendations for the behavior he described, that in and of itself **would not be a violation of confidentiality** rules. It would only be a violation if the therapist provided specific treatment information about the client that was learned or obtained in the course of providing services to the client. (Level III decision in Case No. 08-SGE-12 on 6/29/09)
28. A patient complained about a nurse practitioner **violating his confidentiality** and

his right to dignity and respect by in the manner in which she talked to him in a hallway. The **evidence, records, and witness reports did not provide sufficient evidence** to show that it was **more probable than not** that his right to confidentiality or his right to be treated with dignity and respect were violated. It was determined that the client's **burden of proof had not been met**. (Level III decision in Case Nos. 09-SGE-07 & 09-SGE-10 on 3/18/10)

29. In a break room, an **employee of a hospital asked another employee** with the same last name as the client **if she knew the client**. The asker **had seen the client cashing checks for gambling money at a bar**. There was no evidence that the asker knew that the client was a patient of that hospital. The person asked gave a non-committal response. A third employee, who did know the client, was concerned about the client's gambling issues, so called the client and informed her of the conversation. The information discussed in the break room was related to the client's treatment; however, it **was not observed or obtained "in the course of providing services"**. The observed behavior **occurred in a public place**, outside the course of treatment and, as such, **was not confidential treatment information**. There is **no "reasonable expectation of privacy,"** regarding **observed behavior in public places**. There may have been poor judgment exercised by the employees, but it was not a violation of the client's confidentiality. (Level III decision in Case No. 09-SGE-11 on 4/05/10)
30. A former client of an outpatient methadone clinic complained that he was **not allowed to use a cell phone** even though staff used them. The restriction of cell phone use on program premises was not arbitrary. The clinic has to **ensure that patients' confidentiality is protected**. **Cell phones can and have been used to record and then post to the Internet video of patients in the clinic**. Staff are also prohibited from using cell phones there. If staff were not following that directive, the matter would need to be addressed by program administration since it would not amount to a patient rights violation unless evidence was provided that staff were illicitly video recording clients at the clinic. (Level III decision in Case No. 10-SGE-13 on 3/03/11)
31. A patient alleged that his right to confidentiality was violated when his therapist failed to address the inappropriate sharing of his medical records with outside healthcare and dental clinics. **The issue was held to be moot because the patient was no longer receiving services from the provider and because the evidence presented was insubstantial to show that the allegation was likely to be true and thus be of general importance or significant importance to other patients**. (Level III decision in 14-SGE-0003 decided on 6/26/2015)
32. **A patient was asked to sign two separate release of information forms for personal use by staff**. The recipient of the information was allegedly close to a member of the community that the patient distrusted. **The patient did not cite any specific instances of the staff member sharing the patient's treatment, billing or healthcare information, so no violation of the grievant's confidentiality was**

**found.** (Level III decision in Case No. 15-SGE-0002 on 01/29/2016)

33. A provider's client rights specialist (CRS) did not obtain written consent prior to reading a portion of the client's treatment record in the course of investigating the client's grievance, whereupon a second CRS was assigned to investigate the grievance. Evidence showed that the initial CRS **did not obtain written consent prior to reviewing a portion of the client's treatment record.** The initial CRS lost creditability by changing her version of events from claiming to have read the patient's entire treatment record to claiming to have read only a single document provided by the client entitled "Addendum for Treatment Record." **The fact that the client asked the initial CRS to read the addendum via telephone and did not object when the CRS told the client that the CRS would read the treatment record is immaterial.** The fact that the CRS read the record or a portion thereof is a violation of the client's right to confidentiality because **there was no signed consent.** (Level III decision in Case No. 16-SGE-04 on 4/20/2017)
34. A patient alleged that her right to confidentiality of her treatment records was violated when her **husband was informed of her discharge from an inpatient unit, contrary to her expressed wishes.** Evidence showed that her **husband was called prior to the submission of her Request for Discharge form, which included her wish that family not be informed of her discharge.** Since the evidence was conflicting and since the call was placed before the form was submitted, no violation of the patient's right to confidentiality was found. (Level III decision in Case No. 16-SGE-08 on 5/26/2017)
35. A patient asserted that her right to confidentiality of treatment records was violated when the **provider printed her diagnosis on her prescription and when the provider staff looked at her electronic medical record without a need to know.** **It was determined that it is not, inherently, a violation of a patient's right to confidentiality when a diagnosis is printed on the patient's prescription.** There was no rule found that prohibits the practice and once the patient gives informed consent to take the medication, he or she is consenting to a pharmacist knowing or having a good guess at what the patient's diagnosis is, regardless of whether it is printed on the prescription. It was also concluded that, while CRS's need to have a release of information to view patient records, the manager has access to those records under an exception to Wis. Stat. s. 51.30, specifically, 51.30(4)(b)(1) or 51.30(4)(b)(6). Therefore, it was concluded that the patient's right to confidentiality was not violated when the manager accessed her treatment records to address her complaints. (Level III, Case No. 17-SGE-03 III)
36. A **patient's mother requested that the therapist call her son after expressing concerns that her son may be suicidal. This was not considered a breach of the patient's confidentiality as the mother was not requesting information such as the patient's diagnosis or medications, and the therapist did not discuss the patient's information with the mother during this conversation.** However, the therapist has a "duty to warn" the correct authorities, regardless of confidentiality, if there is a potential risk of harm. There was not a violation of the

patient's rights, as the therapist had determined not to call the police because the client reported he was doing better. Likewise, no violation of the "duty to warn" was found. (Level III Grievance Decision in Case No. 18-SGE-01).

37. A patient grieved when the **provider released treatment records to a retained law firm to defend claims the grievant brought against the provider**. The patient sent a complaint to the Wisconsin Department of Safety and Professional Services. The provider retained legal services after inquiries from the Wisconsin Department of Safety and Professional Services. Because it is permissible to release patient records without the informed written consent of the subject individual in response to a written request by a state agency, **it is determined that the grievant's right to confidentiality was not violated when the provider released portions of her treatment record to a law firm for the purpose of defending claims** brought by the grievant against the provider. (Level III Grievance Decision in Case No. 18-SGE-04)
38. A patient **requested to restrict all employees at the provider from accessing her record**. This request was denied, as employees are able to access the request on a need to know basis. There was **no evidence to suggest employees were wrongfully accessing the patient's treatment record**. Therefore, this denial was not a violation of her right to confidentiality of her treatment record. (Level III grievance decision in Case No. 20-SGE-07)
39. A patient alleged that staff violated her rights when a **social worker enacted the facility's Duty to Protect policy and contacted law enforcement**. It was found at both Level I and Level II that the patient's rights were violated as the **Duty to Protect policy was not properly used as the patient had no plan and no access to weapons. Disclosure of confidential treatment information without proper rationale this was a violation of the patient's right to confidentiality of treatment records**. The facility reviewed and updated their Duty to Protect policy and it is a part of all employee training. As the facility has already taken adequate steps to ensure this did not happen again, there were no further recommendations that the Client Rights Office could make. Level I and Level II both found rights violations. Level III affirms Level I and II. (Level 3 Decision Case No. 22-SGE-04)
40. A patient complained when a **CCS provider requested that the patient sign release forms allowing the CCS provider to share information with outside service providers in order to facilitate a team meeting**, as the patient felt the release forms he had provided the CCS provider which specified that two outside service providers could share information with the CCS provider were satisfactory. The forms which the patient served upon the CCS provider did not specify that the CCS provider was able to share information about the client, and as such, there could be no team meeting. It was not unreasonable, nor a violation of the patient's right to confidentiality of treatment information to require additional release forms in order for the team advocacy meeting to take place. (Level III decision in case 22-

SGE-09).

41. A patient complained when a **CCS provider replied to an email to the patient including the County Human Service Director, as he alleged it was a violation of his right to confidential treatment information.** Wisconsin statute § 51.30(4)(b)(5) specifies situations where consent is not needed to share confidential treatment information. In this case, the patient's consent was not needed to include County Human Service Director, as the email was to coordinate the patient's care and the treatment was contracted through the County. There was no violation of the patient's right to confidentiality of treatment information. (Level III decision in case 22-SGE-09)
42. A patient complained when the **Human Services Director "listened in" during a phone call/appointment between the patient and his psychiatrist,** alleging that the patient's right to confidentiality of treatment information had been violated. Information provided by the County revealed that the phone call was initiated and placed by the Director, in attempt to mediate an updated behavioral contract for the patient as a way for the patient to continue to receive medication prescription from the psychiatrist, who had been subject to increasingly volatile behavior by the patient. Thus, the patient consented to the Director joining the phone appointment. Even if the patient had not consented, Wisconsin law offers exceptions to requiring informed consent, and the situation in which the phone call took place (employees of the same provider discussing appropriateness for treatment) is a listed exception. (Level III decision in case number 22-SGE-10)
43. A grievant filed a complaint stating that he had **signed a blank Release of Information (ROI) form that he was told would be completed at a later time to allow information to be obtained from his medical provider.** The grievant stated that instead, **the form was improperly filled out after he signed it to allow the provider to disclose information to his now ex-wife.** The grievant stated that he was in a contentious divorce with his now ex-wife, and would not have agreed to disclose information to her. The Executive Director for the Provider stated that the form had not been filled out properly (the purpose of the disclosure section was not properly filled out) but that the grievant did agree to share information with his now ex-wife. The investigation concluded that it **was more likely than not that the provider improperly added the grievant's ex-wife's name to the ROI form after the fact.** The provider was advised to change its form with regard to participant's partners to state that information will only be disclosed in a very limited set of circumstances, so as to properly protect the confidential information of participants. Training on the importance of client confidentiality was also recommended. (Level III Decision in case number 22-SGE-02).
44. The resident's guardians filed a complaint **alleging that staff at the resident's group home had improperly disclosed information to the resident's potential employer.** The investigation was **unable to determine who disclosed the information** to the potential employer, and therefore no rights violations were found.

The Level I decision recommended that all staff at the group home be re-trained on resident confidentiality, and provided proof that the re-training had occurred. No further relief was able to be offered. (Level III decision in Case Number 22-SGE-03).

[See: "Introduction to Digest-Date Last Updated" page.]