



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 17, 2017

Ms. Trudi Dill
Deputy City Attorney
City of Temple
2 North Main Street, Suite 308
Temple, Texas 76501

OR2017-15900

Dear Ms. Dill:

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# 667085.

The City of Temple (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident report. The city claims the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

The submitted information includes body worn camera recordings of city police officers. 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). The requestor does not give the requisite information under section 1701.661(a). As the requestor did not properly request the body worn camera recordings at issue pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach these recordings and the city is not required to release them.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).

The remaining information contains a court-filed document that is subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code, which provides the following:

Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). Although the city asserts the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17), which we have marked, is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108, this section is discretionary and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 177 (1977) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.108); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). In addition, common-law privacy is not applicable to information contained in public records. *See Cox Broad. Corp. v. Cohn*, 420 U.S. 469, 496 (1975) (action for invasion of privacy cannot be maintained where information is in public domain); *Star-Telegram, Inc. v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54, 57 (Tex. 1992) (law cannot recall information once in public domain). Therefore, the city may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) under section 552.108 or common-law privacy. However, section 552.130 of the Government Code makes information confidential under the Act.² Accordingly, we will consider the applicability of section 552.130 to the information at issue.

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address the other argument of the city to withhold this information.

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 at 2 (1987), 480 at 5 (1987).

The city asserts the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, the information at issue concerns an alleged violation of section 32.51 of the Penal Code. Section 32.51(b)(1) provides “[a] person commits an offense if the person, with the intent to harm or defraud another, obtains, possesses, transfers, or uses an item of . . . identifying information of another person without the other person’s consent[.]” Penal Code § 32.51(b)(1). Article 2.29 of the Code of Criminal Procedure pertains to alleged violations of section 32.51 that occurred on or after September 1, 2005, and provides as follows:

(a) A peace officer to whom an alleged violation of Section 32.51, Penal Code, is reported shall make a written report to the law enforcement agency that employs the peace officer that includes the following information:

- (1) the name of the victim;
- (2) the name of the suspect, if known;
- (3) the type of identifying information obtained, possessed, transferred, or used in violation of Section 32.51, Penal Code; and
- (4) the results of any investigation.

(b) On the victim’s request, the law enforcement agency shall provide the report created under Subsection (a) to the victim. In providing the report, the law enforcement agency shall redact any otherwise confidential information that is included in the report, other than the information described by Subsection (a).

Crim. Proc. Code art. 2.29. For purposes of article 2.29, an offense is committed on or after September 1, 2005, if no “element of the offense occurs before that date.” Act of Jun. 17, 2005, 79th Leg., R.S., ch. 294, § 1(b), 2005 Tex. Gen. Laws 885.

As noted above, the information at issue relates to an alleged violation of section 32.51 of the Penal Code. The requestor is the victim, and the alleged offense occurred after September 1, 2005. Therefore, the remaining information is subject to article 2.29 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and must be released to the requestor, except to the extent the information is confidential. Crim. Proc. Code art. 2.29(b). As noted above, section 552.108 does not make information confidential. *See* ORD 117. Thus, the city may not withhold the remaining information from this requestor under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, because sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code are confidentiality provisions, we will address their applicability to the remaining information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “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 the *Industrial Foundation* decision. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). The Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See 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 requestor has a right of access to her own date of birth pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). However, the city must withhold the offender’s date of birth in the remaining documents under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. We also find some of the remaining information, which we have marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must also withhold the information we have marked 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. Because section 552.130 protects personal privacy, the requestor has a right of access to the requestor’s own motor vehicle record information 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). Nevertheless, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked, as well as the visible license plates and audible plate number in the submitted dash-cam recordings, under section 552.130 of the Government Code.


To conclude, because the requestor did not properly request the submitted body worn camera recordings pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach the body worn camera recordings at issue and the city is not required to release them. With the exception of the

information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code, the city must release the information we have marked under section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code in its entirety. The city must withhold the offender's date of birth in the remaining documents and the information 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, as well as the visible license plates and audible plate number in the submitted dash-cam recordings, 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.

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# 667085

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

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.