



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 2, 2019

Mr. L. Brian Narvaez
Counsel for the City of McKinney
Brown & Hofmeister, L. L. P.
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2019-11699

Dear Mr. Narvaez:

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# 763066 (Reference Nos. P010396-011019 and P010397-011019).

The City of McKinney (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for 9-1-1 audio, body worn camera recordings, and dashboard camera recordings pertaining to a specified incident.¹ You state the city has made a portion of the responsive information available to the requestor. You claim portions of submitted

¹You state, and provide documentation showing, the city sent the requestor a cost estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code, and the requestor accepted the cost estimate. *See* Gov't Code § 552.2615. The estimate of charges required the requestor to provide a deposit for payment of anticipated costs under section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.263(a). You also inform us the city received the required payment on February 5, 2019. *See id.* § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date governmental body receives bond or deposit).

information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.² We have considered the claimed exception and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find the information you indicated, and the additional information we indicated, meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information you indicated and the additional information we indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s or driver’s license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold all audible and visible license plates within the remaining information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information you indicated and the additional information we indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold all audible and visible license plates within the remaining information under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

²We note, and you acknowledge, the city did not comply with the requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting a ruling from this office. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(b). Nonetheless, because sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider their applicability to the submitted information. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352. 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).

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 M. Graham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JMG/jxd

Ref: ID# 763066

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)