



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 31, 2018

Ms. Alexis G. Allen  
Counsel for the City of Red Oak  
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, L.L.P.  
500 North Akard Street, Suite 1800  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2018-02163

Dear Ms. Allen:

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# 696063 (File Ref. No. 93734).

The City of Red Oak (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You state the city released some of the requested information, including the police officer's crash report pursuant to section 550.065(c) of the Transportation Code. *See* Transp. Code § 550.065(c) (providing for release of accident report to person or entity listed under this subsection). You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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 a personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130. We note section 552.130 protects personal privacy. Accordingly, the requestor has a right of access to her client's motor vehicle record information under section 552.023 of the Government Code and it may not be withheld from her under section 552.130. *See id.* § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information

concerning themselves). Upon review, we find the submitted video recordings contains motor vehicle record information that does not belong to the requestor's client. In this instance, the city states it does not possess the technological capability to redact information from video files. Accordingly, the city must withhold the submitted video recordings in their entirety under section 552.130 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 364 (1983). Further, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. However, we find none of the remaining information consists of motor vehicle record information subject to section 552.130. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision."<sup>1</sup> Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *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. 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.). Thus, the city must withhold the public citizen's dates of birth we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city must withhold the submitted video recordings in their entirety and the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the public citizen's dates of birth we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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.


---

<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 requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(b) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates, or that party's representative, solely on grounds that information is considered confidential by privacy principles). Because such information is confidential with respect to the general public, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, then the city should again seek a ruling from this office.

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,



Paige Thompson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PT/eb

Ref: ID# 696063

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)