



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 19, 2017

Ms. Jo Ann Pate  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
200 Texas Street, 3rd Floor  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-6311

OR2017-28749

Dear Ms. Pate:

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# 688470.

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received two requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to a specified police report. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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:

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 body worn camera recordings pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released. 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).

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 *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683.

The remaining information pertains to a report of alleged sexual assault. In Open Records Decision No. 393 (1983), this office concluded generally, only information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense may be withheld under common-law privacy; however, because the identifying information was inextricably intertwined with other releasable information, the governmental body was required to withhold the entire report. ORD 393 at 2; *see* Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982); *see also Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such information); Open Records Decision No. 440 (1986) (detailed descriptions of serious sexual offenses must be withheld). In this instance, the city seeks to withhold the entirety of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, the city has not demonstrated, nor does it otherwise appear, this is a situation in which the entirety of the information at issue must be withheld on the basis of common-law privacy. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the entirety of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis. However, upon review, we find some of the remaining information, which we marked, identifies a sexual assault victim, and therefore satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Thus, the city must withhold the identifying information we marked, and the corresponding information in the submitted audio recording, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Some of the remaining information is protected under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *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). Further, this office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (choice of insurance carrier), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information). The 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.). We note some of the information at issue relates to an individual who has been de-identified and whose privacy interest is thus protected. Information relating to individuals who have been de-identified may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. Upon review, we find the information we marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Thus, with the exception of the information pertaining to an individual who has been de-identified, the city must withhold the information we marked and all public citizens' dates of birth 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. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked and indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, "Notwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the city must withhold the insurance policy number we marked under section 552.136 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 it need not be released. The city must withhold (1) the identity of a victim of sexual assault we marked and noted under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, (2) the information we marked and all public citizens' dates of

birth, with the exception of information pertaining to an individual who has been de-identified, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, (3) the motor vehicle record information we marked and indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code, and (4) the insurance policy number we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

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](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,



Emily Kunst  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

EK/tdw

Ref: ID# 688470

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)