



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 28, 2015

Mr. David V. Overcash
Counsel for the City of Anna
Wolfe, Tidwell & McCoy, L.L.P.
2591 Dallas Parkway, Suite 205
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2015-22628

Dear Mr. Overcash:

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# 584843 (File No. C03029PIR2015050806-02).

The City of Anna (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, 552.130, and 552.147 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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 information subject to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. Section 550.065 applies only to a written report of an accident required under section 550.061, 550.062, or 601.004. Act of June 1, 2015, 84th Leg., R.S., ch. 936, § 1, 2015 Tex. Sess. Law Serv. 3256 (Vernon) (to be codified at Transp. Code § 550.065(a)(1)). 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. Transp. Code §§ 550.061 (operator's accident report), .062 (officer's accident report). An accident report 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. *Id.* § 550.065(b). However, a governmental entity may release an accident report in accordance with subsections (c) and (c-1). Act of June 1, 2015, 84th Leg., R.S., ch. 936, § 1, 2015 Tex. Sess. Law Serv. 3256, 3256-57 (Vernon) (to be codified at Transp. Code § 550.065(c), (c-1)).

Section 550.065(c) provides a governmental entity shall release an accident report to a person or entity listed under this subsection. *Id.* § 550.065(c).

In this instance, the requestor is not a person listed under section 550.065(c). Thus, the submitted accident report is confidential under section 550.065(b), and the city must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code. However, section 550.065(c-1) requires the city to create a redacted accident report that may be requested by any person. *Id.* § 550.065(c-1). The redacted accident report may not include the information listed in subsection (f)(2). *Id.* Therefore, the requestor has a right of access to the redacted accident report. Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy for a portion of the information at issue, we note a statutory right of access prevails over the common law. *See Center Point Energy Houston Elec. LLC v. Harris County Toll Road*, 436 F.3d 541, 544 (5th Cir. 2006) (common law controls only where there is no conflicting or controlling statutory law). Accordingly, no portion of the redacted accident report may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

You also assert portions of the accident report are confidential under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 excepts from disclosure information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title, or registration issued by an agency of this state or another state or country. *See Gov't Code* § 552.130(a)(1)-(2). We note a statutory right of access generally prevails over the Act's general exceptions to disclosure. *See Open Record 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). However, because section 552.130 has its own access provisions, we conclude section 552.130 is not a general exception under the Act. Thus, we must address the conflict between the confidentiality provided under section 552.130 of the Government Code and the right of access provided under section 550.065(c-1) of the Transportation Code for the redacted accident report. Where information falls within both a general and a specific provision of law, the specific provision prevails over the general. *See Horizon/CMS Healthcare Corp. v. Auld*, 34 S.W.3d 887, 901 (Tex. 2000) ("more specific statute controls over the more general"); *Cuellar v. State*, 521 S.W.2d 211 (Tex. Crim. App. 1975) (under well-established rule of statutory construction, specific statutory provisions prevail over general ones). Section 550.065(c) specifically provides access only to accident reports of the type at issue, while section 552.130 generally excepts motor vehicle record information maintained in any context. Thus, we conclude the access to accident reports provided under section 550.065(c-1) is more specific than the general confidentiality provided under section 552.130. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the redacted accident report under section 552.130, and it must be released under section 550.065(c-1).

Next, we address your arguments for the remaining information. Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection,

investigation, or prosecution of crime.” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706, 710 (Tex. 1977). You state, and provide documentation showing, the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(1) relates to a pending criminal investigation. Based upon this representation, we conclude the release of the information you marked would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177, 186-87 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559, 560-61 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the information you marked. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). 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.¹ *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. Additionally, because privacy is a personal right that lapses at death, the common-law right to privacy does not encompass information that relates only to 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). Therefore, information relating to a deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law privacy grounds. Accordingly, the city must withhold the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the remaining date of birth pertains to a deceased individual. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining date of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

As noted above, section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s license, driver’s license, motor vehicle title or registration, or

¹Section 552.102(a) excepts 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).

personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(a). We note the purpose of section 552.130 is to protect the privacy interests of individuals. Because the right of privacy lapses at death, driver's license information that pertains solely to deceased individuals may not be withheld under section 552.130. *See Moore*, 589 S.W.2d at 491; ORD 272. We note a portion of the remaining information you have marked pertains to a deceased individual. Thus, this information may not be withheld under section 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.147(a) of the Government Code excepts the social security number of a living individual from public disclosure. Gov't Code § 552.147(a). Accordingly, the city may withhold the social security numbers we marked under section 552.147 of the Government Code.

In summary, the submitted accident report is confidential under section 550.065(b). The city must release the redacted accident report to the requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c-1). The city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the dates of birth we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the social security numbers we marked under section 552.147 of the Government Code. 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# 584843

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)