



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 13, 2017

Ms. Leann M. Quinn
City Secretary
City of Cedar Park
600 North Bell Boulevard
Cedar Park, Texas 78613

OR2017-00919

Dear Ms. Quinn:

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# 644783 (ORR# 17-142).

The City of Cedar Park (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified accident, including CAD reports and witness statements. The city states it does not have some of the requested information.¹ The city also states it will provide some of the requested information to the requestor, but claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the procedural obligations of the city under section 552.301 of the Government Code and section 1702.662(a) of the Occupations Code. Section 552.301 of the Government Code prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. Gov't Code § 552.301(b). The city informs us it received the request for information on

¹The Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist when the request for information was received. *See generally Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed).

November 3, 2016, and it was closed for business on November 11, 2016. Thus, the city's ten-business-day deadline under section 552.301(b) was November 18, 2016. However, the envelope containing the request for a ruling from this office is metermarked November 21, 2016. *See* Gov't Code § 552.308 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail). Therefore, the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301(b).

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that 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); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). A compelling reason exists when third-party interests are at stake or when information is confidential under other law. Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). Section 552.108 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 5 (2000) (untimely request for decision resulted in waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). Thus, the claim of the city under section 552.108 to withhold the remaining information is not a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness for section 552.302 purposes, and, except for the body worn camera recording, the city may not withhold the information on that ground. But because sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code make information confidential, they can provide compelling reasons to overcome this presumption. Therefore, we will consider whether these sections require the city to withhold any of the remaining information.

Nevertheless, we note the submitted information includes an officer's body worn camera recording. Body worn cameras are subject to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, which provides the procedures a requestor must follow when seeking a body worn camera recording. Section 1701.661(a) reads as follows:

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). We note the requestor gave the requisite information under section 1701.661(a) for the body worn camera recording. Section 1701.662(a) of the Occupations Code reads as follows:

Notwithstanding Section 552.301(b), Government Code, a governmental body's request for a decision from the attorney general about whether a requested body worn camera recording falls within an exception to public disclosure is considered timely if made not later than the *20th business day* after the date of receipt of the written request.

Id. § 1701.662(a) (emphasis added). Thus, notwithstanding the city's failure to comply with section 552.301(b), we find the city timely requested a decision to withhold the submitted body worn camera recording in accordance with section 1701.662(a). Accordingly, we will address the city's arguments to withhold the body worn camera recording under section 552.108.

Section 552.108(a) 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: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]" Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the information at issue 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). The city states the submitted body worn camera recording relates to a pending criminal investigation or prosecution. Based on this representation, we conclude the release of this information 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) (delineating law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, the city may withhold the submitted body worn camera recording under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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). 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.² *Tex. 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. Thus, the city must withhold the dates of birth of public citizens in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code 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. We note section 552.130 protects personal privacy, and the city indicates the requestor has a right of access to some of the motor vehicle record information at issue pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.023(a) ("person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held 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). We agree the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information it has marked, as well as the motor vehicle record information located on the submitted 9-1-1 audio recording, under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

To conclude, the city may withhold the submitted body worn camera recording under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the dates of birth of public citizens in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must also withhold the motor vehicle record information it has marked, as well as the motor vehicle record information located on the submitted 9-1-1 audio recording, under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.³


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.

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).

³Because the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released, the city must again seek a decision from this office if it receives another request for the same information from another requestor.

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,



James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/bw

Ref: ID# 644783

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)