



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 16, 2015

Mr. Gary A. Scott
Assistant City Attorney
City of Conroe
P.O. Box 3066
Conroe, Texas 77305-3066

OR2015-11882

Dear Mr. Scott:

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# 567516.

The City of Conroe (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified motor vehicle accident. You state the city has released some responsive information. You claim the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.108 and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

We first consider the requestor's statutory right to access the information at issue. Section 550.065 of the Transportation Code provides information that "relates to a motor vehicle accident reported under [chapter 550]" is privileged and for the confidential use of the Texas Department of Transportation or a local governmental agency of Texas that has use for the information for accident prevention purposes. Transp. Code § 550.065(a)-(b). Chapter 550 requires the creation of a written report when the accident resulted in injury to or the death of a person or damage to the property of any person to the apparent extent of \$1,000 or more. *Id.* §§ 550.061 (operator's accident report), .062 (officer's accident report). A governmental entity may release information related to a reported accident only in accordance with subsections (c) and (e). *Id.* § 550.065(c), (e). Section 550.065(c)(4) provides a governmental entity shall release such information to a person who provides two of the following three pieces of information: (1) the date of the accident, (2) the name of any

person involved in the accident, and (3) the specific address or the highway or street where the accident occurred. *Id.* § 550.065(c)(4).

In *City of San Antonio v. Abbott*, the court of appeals considered the applicability of section 550.065 to certain information related to an accident. 432 S.W.3d 429 (Tex. App.—Austin 2014, pet. denied). The information at issue consisted of call-for-service and dispatch logs, and the requestor did not provide the requisite information pursuant to section 550.065(c)(4) to obtain the logs. The city argued the plain meaning of the phrase, “information that . . . relates to a motor vehicle accident” in section 550.065 includes *any* information pertaining to an accident reported under chapter 550, and thus, encompasses the information in its logs. Thus, the city contended the logs are confidential because the information relates to motor vehicle accidents reported under chapter 550. The court of appeals agreed with the city’s interpretation of section 550.065. The court held the phrase “relates to” is “very broad” and the Legislature’s use of the phrase “has the effect of broadening the scope of [s]ection 550.065 to render more than the actual accident reports confidential.” *Id.* at 432. Because the court found the language in section 550.065 to be unambiguous and encompass more than the actual accident report required to be filed under chapter 550, it concluded the city’s call-for-service and dispatch logs are confidential under section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code. Relying on the court’s interpretation of the broad scope of section 550.065, we construe the converse to be true when the requestor does provide the requisite information pursuant to section 550.065(c)(4). Thus, based on the court’s rationale, when a person provides two of the required pieces of information to a governmental entity, it must release any information that relates to a motor vehicle accident required to be reported under chapter 550. Such a release is not limited to the accident report itself. *Id.* at 433.

Here, the requested information relates to a motor vehicle accident required to be reported under chapter 550 because it resulted in injury to or the death of a person or damage to the property of a person to the apparent extent of \$1,000 or more, and the requestor has provided the city with the requisite information. Although the city asserts section 552.108 to withhold the information, information expressly made public by statute may not be withheld from the public under the general exceptions to public disclosure under the Act. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 613 at 4 (1993) (exceptions in Act cannot impinge on statutory right of access to information), 451 (1986) (specific statutory right of access provisions overcome general exception to disclosure under the Act). Because section 552.108 is a general exception under the Act, the requestor’s statutory access under section 550.065(c)(4) prevails and the city may not withhold the information under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

The city seeks to withhold the submitted motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s license, driver’s license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country

is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130. Although a specific statutory right of access prevails over general exceptions to disclosure under the Act, because section 552.130 has its own access provisions, we conclude section 552.130 is not a general exception under the Act. Accordingly, the motor vehicle record information in the submitted information is confidential under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Because some of the submitted information is specifically protected from public disclosure by section 552.130 of the Government Code, we find there is a conflict between this provision and the access provided under section 550.065(c)(4) of the Transportation Code.

Where general and specific statutes are in irreconcilable conflict, the specific provision typically prevails as an exception to the general provision, unless the general provision was enacted later and there is clear evidence the legislature intended the general provision to prevail. *See id.* § 311.026(b); *see also City of Lake Dallas v. Lake Cities Mun. Util. Auth.*, 555 S.W.2d 163, 168 (Tex. Civ. App.—Fort Worth 1977, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Section 550.065 governs the release of all information relating to a motor vehicle accident reported under chapter 550, while section 552.130 generally excepts motor vehicle record information maintained in any context. Thus, we conclude the access provided under section 550.065(c)(4) is more specific than the general confidentiality provided under section 552.130. *Cf.* Transp. Code § 550.065(e)-(f). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.”¹ Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses constitutional privacy, which protects two kinds of interests. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S.589, 599-600 (1977); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the “zones of privacy,” pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education, that have been recognized by the United States Supreme Court. *See Fajjo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981); ORD 455 at 3-7. The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir.1985); ORD 455 at 6-7. This aspect of constitutional privacy balances the individual's privacy interest against the public's interest in the information. *See* ORD 455 at 7. Constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for “the most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 8 (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492).

We note the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death and therefore may not be asserted solely on behalf of a deceased individual. *See Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981) (privacy rights lapse upon death). However, the

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

United States Supreme Court has determined that surviving family members can have a privacy interest in information relating to their deceased relatives. *See Nat'l Archives & Records Admin. v. Favish*, 541 U.S. 157 (2004). The submitted information contains photographs of a deceased individual. You inform us you notified the deceased individual's family of the request for information and of the family's right to assert a privacy interest in the submitted information. You further inform us a member of the deceased individual's family asserts a privacy interest in the information at issue and objects to its release. After reviewing the submitted comments and the information at issue, we find the family's privacy interest in some of the information at issue outweighs the public's interest in the disclosure of this information. Therefore, the photographs we have marked are confidential pursuant to constitutional privacy and the holding in *Favish*.

Thus, there is a conflict between the requestor's right of access to the photographs of the deceased pursuant to section 550.065(c)(4) of the Transportation Code and the confidentiality afforded the photographs by constitutional privacy. Under the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution, the United States Constitution and duly-enacted federal statutes are "the supreme law of the Land," and states have a responsibility to enforce federal law. *See* U.S. Const., art. VI, cl. 2; *Howlett v. Rose*, 496 U.S. 356, 367-69 (1990). As a federal law, constitutional privacy preempts any conflicting state provisions, including section 550.065 of the Transportation Code. *See Equal Employment Opportunity Comm'n v. City of Orange, Tex.*, 905 F. Supp. 381, 382 (E.D. Tex. 1995) (federal law prevails over inconsistent provision of state law). Thus, we conclude the city must withhold the photographs of the deceased, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy and the holding in *Favish*. However, we find none of the remaining information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of constitutional privacy.

In summary, the city must withhold the photographs of the deceased, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy and the holding in *Favish*. The city must release the remaining information to the requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c) of the Transportation Code.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Cindy Nettles". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name being more prominent.

Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/dls

Ref: ID# 567516

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)