



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 21, 2016

Ms. Linda Hight
Records Coordinator
City of Cleburne
P.O. Box 677
Cleburne, Texas 76033-0677

OR2016-28266

Dear Ms. Hight:

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# 638846.

The City of Cleburne (the "city") received a request for information related to a specified incident. You state you have released some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes police officers' body worn camera recordings. Body worn cameras are subject to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. Chapter 1701 provides the procedures a requestor must follow when seeking a body worn camera recording. Section 1701.661(a) provides the following:

A member of the public is required to provide the following information when submitting a written request to a law enforcement agency for information recorded by a body worn camera:

- (1) the date and approximate time of the recording;
- (2) the specific location where the recording occurred; and

(3) the name of one or more persons known to be a subject of the recording.

Occ. Code § 1701.661(a). In this instance, the requestor does not give the requisite information under section 1701.661(a). As the requestor did not properly request the submitted body worn camera recordings pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and the city is not required to release it.¹ However, pursuant to section 1701.661(b), a “failure to provide all the information required by Subsection (a) to be part of a request for recorded information does not preclude the requestor from making a future request for the same recorded information.” *Id.* § 1701.661(b).

Next, we must address the procedural obligations of the city under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.301(b) of the Government Code, a governmental body must ask for the attorney general’s decision and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days after receiving the request. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(b). The city received the request for information on September 26, 2016. You do not inform us you were closed for any business days between September 26, 2016 and October 10, 2016. Accordingly, you were required to provide the information required by section 552.301(b) by October 10, 2016. However, the envelope in which you provided the information required by section 552.301(b) was meter-marked October 11, 2016. *See id.* § 552.308(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Accordingly, we conclude the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body’s failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code results in the legal presumption the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 630 (1994), 586 (1991), 319 (1982). This office has held a compelling reason exists to withhold information when third-party interests are at stake or when information is made confidential by another source of law. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977) (construing predecessor statute). Although the city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code, this exception to disclosure protects a governmental body’s interest and may be waived; as such, section 552.108 does not constitute a compelling reason to withhold information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 (1977) (statutory

¹As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address the arguments against its disclosure.

predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). Consequently, the city has waived its claim under section 552.108. Accordingly, none of the submitted information may be withheld under that exception to disclosure. However, because sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code make information confidential, they can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness. Thus, we will address the applicability of these sections to 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 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. This office has also concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). 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.² *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. Upon review, the city has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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 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 section 552.130 protects privacy interests. Accordingly, the requestor has a right of access to his motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code and it may not be withheld from him. *See id.* § 552.023(a) (“person or a person’s authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held

²Section 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).

by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests"); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning herself). Accordingly, the city must withhold the visible license plates, along with all audible motor vehicle record information that does not pertain to the requestor, within the audio and video portions of the submitted video recordings under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, as the requestor did not properly request the body worn camera recordings pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information and the city need not release the submitted body worn camera recordings in response to this request for information. The city must withhold the visible license plates, along with all audible motor vehicle record information that does not pertain to the requestor, within the audio and video portions of the submitted video recordings under section 552.130 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,



Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/som

Ref: ID# 638846

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)