



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 24, 2018

Ms. Ashley L. White  
Counsel for the City of Lancaster  
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.  
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800  
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2018-01564

Dear Ms. White:

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# 692560 (Lancaster ID# W006053-102717).

The Lancaster Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for records related to a specified accident. You state you will release some information. You claim the submitted body worn camera recordings were not properly requested pursuant to section 1701.661 of the Occupations Code. Additionally, you claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information consists of 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 provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) 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 at issue 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).

The submitted information includes a CR-3 accident report. 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 information subject to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. Section 550.065 applies only to a written report of an accident required under section 550.061, 550.062, or 601.004. *See* Transp. Code § 550.065(a)(1). Chapter 550 requires the creation of a written report when the accident resulted in injury to or the death of a person or damage to the property of any person to the apparent extent of \$1,000 or more. *Id.* §§ 550.061 (operator’s accident report), .062 (officer’s accident report). An accident report is privileged and for the confidential use of the Texas Department of Transportation or a local governmental agency of Texas that has use for the information for accident prevention purposes. *Id.* § 550.065(b). However, a governmental entity shall release an accident report in accordance with subsections (c) and (c-1). *Id.* § 550.065(c), (c-1). Section 550.065(c) provides a governmental entity shall release an accident report to a person or entity listed under this subsection. *Id.* § 550.065(c).

In this instance, the requestor has not established she is a person listed under section 550.065(c). Thus, the submitted accident report is confidential with respect to this requestor under section 550.065(b), and the department must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code. However, section 550.065(c-1) requires the department to create a redacted accident report that may be requested by any person. *Id.* § 550.065(c-1). The redacted accident report may not include the information listed in subsection (f)(2). *Id.* Therefore, the requestor has a right of access to the redacted accident report. Although the department asserts section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy to withhold the accident report, we note a statutory right of access prevails over the common law. *See Center Point Energy Houston Elec. LLC v. Harris County Toll Rd. Auth.*, 436 F.3d 541, 544 (5th Cir. 2006) (common law controls only where there is no conflicting or controlling statutory law); *Collins v. Tex Mall, L.P.*, 297 S.W.3d 409, 415 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2009, no pet.) (statutory provision controls and preempts common law only when statute directly conflicts with common law principle). Thus, no portion of the redacted CR-3 accident report may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy. Accordingly, the department must release the redacted accident report to the requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c-1).

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. Upon review, we find portions of the remaining information consist of motor vehicle record information. In this instance, you state the department does not possess the technological capability to redact information from the dashboard camera video recordings. Thus, we agree the department must withhold the entireties of the submitted dashboard camera video recordings and the additional information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> *See* Open Records Decision No. 364 (1983).

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). This office has also 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. 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Further, the court of appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *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 find portions of the information at issue satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the department 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. However, we find the department has failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the department may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected,

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.”<sup>2</sup> Gov’t Code § 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 department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, as the requestor did not properly request the body worn camera recordings at issue pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released. The submitted accident report must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code; however, the department must release the redacted accident report to the requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c-1) of the Transportation Code. The department must withhold the entireties of the submitted dashboard camera video recordings and the additional information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The department 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. The department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The department 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,



Kelly McWethy  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KSM/som

---

<sup>2</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).

Ref: ID# 692560

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)