



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 21, 2017

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

OR2017-29063

Dear Ms. Thomas:

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# 688828.

The City of Temple (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. 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.

Initially, we note the city has only submitted video recordings pertaining to the specified incident. To the extent information responsive to the remainder of the request existed on the date the city received the request, we assume you have released it. *See* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible). If you have not released any such information, you must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 552.101. This section encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. We note the submitted information contains recordings from city police department (the "department") officers' body worn cameras. Body worn cameras are subject to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. Section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code states the information a requestor must provide when seeking a body worn camera recording. *See* Occ.

Code § 1701.661(a). In this instance, the requestor provides the requisite information. We understand the recordings at issue were required to be made by law or the policies of the department and the recordings relate to a law enforcement purpose. *See id.* § 1701.661(h). We understand the recordings at issue are or could be used as evidence in a criminal prosecution. *See id.* § 1701.661(d). Additionally, we have no indication the recordings document an incident that involves the use of deadly force by an officer or relates to an administrative or criminal investigation of an officer. *See id.* § 1701.660(a). The submitted recordings demonstrate they were not made in a private space for the purposes of section 1701.661(f). *See id.* §§ 1701.661(f), .651(3) (defining “private space” for purposes of section 1701.661(f)). Section 1701.661(f) provides, in relevant part:

A law enforcement agency may not release any portion . . . of a recording involving the investigation of conduct that constitutes a misdemeanor punishable by fine only and does not result in an arrest, without written authorization from the person who is the subject of that portion of the recording or, if the person is deceased, from the person’s authorized representative.

*Id.* § 1701.661(f). The city states the video recordings at issue consist of body worn camera recordings involving an investigation of conduct that constitutes a misdemeanor punishable by fine only and which did not result in an arrest. The city further states it does not have permission for release from all of the subjects of the recordings at issue. *See id.* Accordingly, we find the city must withhold the body worn camera recordings, which we have indicated, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.661(f) of the Occupations Code. However, we find the remaining recordings are not body worn camera recordings. Therefore, the remaining information is not subject to section 1701.661 of the Occupations Code. Accordingly we will consider whether the remaining information is otherwise excepted under the Act.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). 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.). Upon review, we conclude some of the submitted information meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have indicated 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.<sup>1</sup> See Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the body worn camera recordings, which we have indicated, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.661(f) of the Occupations Code. The city must withhold the information we have indicated 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 indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.<sup>2</sup>

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,



Meredith L. Coffman  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MLC/tdw

---

<sup>1</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

<sup>2</sup>We note the remaining information contains a social security number. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act. See Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

Ref: ID# 688828

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)