



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 17, 2019

Ms. Karen Stack
Deputy City Secretary II
City of Brenham
P. O. Box 1059
Brenham, Texas 77834-1059

OR2019-13247

Dear Ms. Stack:

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# 765948 (Reference No. 19-03-15).

The City of Brenham (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.130, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes a grand jury subpoena and information obtained through the grand jury subpoena. The judiciary is expressly excluded from the requirements of the Act. Gov't Code § 552.003(1)(B). This office has determined for purposes of the Act, a grand jury is a part of the judiciary and therefore not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 411 (1984). Further, records kept by a governmental body that is acting as an agent for a grand jury are considered records in the constructive possession of the grand jury, and are also not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 513 (1988), 411, 398 (1983). The fact that information collected or prepared by another person or entity is submitted to the grand jury does not necessarily mean such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession when the same information also is held in the other person's or entity's own capacity. Information held by another person or entity but not produced at the direction of the grand jury may well be protected under one of the Act's specific exceptions to disclosure, but such information is not excluded from the reach of the Act by the judiciary exclusion. *See* ORD 513. Thus, to the extent the city holds the information at issue solely as an agent of the grand jury, such information consists of records of the judiciary that are not subject to disclosure under the Act, and the city is not

required to release that information in response to the instant request. To the extent the city holds the information at issue in its own capacity and not solely as an agent of the grand jury, the information is subject to the Act and must be released unless it falls within an exception to disclosure.

Next, we note the information at issue includes a CR-3 accident report that is 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).

Here, the requestor is a person listed under section 550.065(c). Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, we note a statutory right of access prevails over the Act's general exceptions to public disclosure. *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 CR-3 accident report may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

Additionally, you raise section 552.130 of the Government Code for the motor vehicle record information contained in the accident report. We note a statutory right of access generally prevails over the Act's general exceptions to disclosure. *See, e.g.,* Open Records Decision Nos. 613 at 4 (1993) (exceptions in Act cannot impinge on statutory right of access to information), 451 (1986) (specific statutory right of access provisions overcome general exception to disclosure under the Act). However, because section 552.130 has its own access provisions, we conclude section 552.130 is not a general exception under the Act. Thus, we must address the conflict between the confidentiality provided under section 552.130 of the Government Code and the right of access provided under section 550.065(c) of the Transportation Code for the accident report. Where information falls within both a general and a specific provision of law, the specific provision prevails over the general. *See Horizon/CMS Healthcare Corp. v. Auld*, 34 S.W.3d 887, 901 (Tex. 2000) (“more specific statute controls over the more general”); *Cuellar v. State*, 521 S.W.2d 211 (Tex. Crim. App. 1975) (under well-established rule of statutory construction, specific statutory provisions

prevail over general ones); Open Records Decision Nos. 598 (1991), 583 (1990), 451. Section 550.065(c) specifically provides access only to accident reports of the type at issue, while section 552.130 generally excepts motor vehicle record information maintained in any context. Thus, we conclude the access to the accident report provided under section 550.065(c) is more specific than the general confidentiality provided under section 552.130. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the accident report under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Therefore, the city must release the CR-3 accident report to the requestor in its entirety pursuant to section 550.065(c) of the Transportation Code.

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. This section encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. The remaining information includes video recordings from police officers’ body worn cameras. Body worn cameras are subject to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. Section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code 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 provides the requisite information for the body worn camera recordings at issue. You state the submitted recordings 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). Further, you state the recordings 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)). We note, however, 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 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). You state the video recordings at issue pertain to the investigation of conduct that constitutes a misdemeanor punishable by fine only and which did not result in an arrest. We have no indication the city has received written authorizations for release from all subjects of the recordings. *See id.* Accordingly, we find the city must withhold the submitted body worn camera video recordings under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.661(f) of the Occupations Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 560.003 of the Government Code, which provides, “[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under [the Act].” Gov’t Code § 560.003; *see id.* § 560.001(1) (“biometric identifier” means retina or iris scan, fingerprint, voiceprint, or record of hand or face geometry). There is no indication the requestor has a right of access to the biometric identifiers under section 560.002. *See id.* § 560.002(1)(A) (governmental body may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose individual’s biometric identifier to another person unless the individual consents to disclosure). Accordingly, the city must withhold the fingerprints you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by statute, such as the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part:

- (a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.
- (c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient’s behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(a)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This office

has concluded the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). Upon review, we find the information you marked constitutes records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that was created or is maintained by a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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 citizens' dates of birth you marked in the remaining information 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. Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the information you marked and the additional information we marked consists of motor vehicle record information subject to section 552.130. We note, however, section 552.130 protects personal privacy. We further note the requestor represents the insurance provider for two of the individuals whose information is at issue. As such, the requestor, if acting as the insured individuals' authorized representative, has a right of access to the insured individuals' motor vehicle record information. *See id.* § 552.023(a) (“[a] person or a person's authorized representative has a special right of access, beyond the right of the general public, to information held by a governmental body that relates to the person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests”); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when an individual or authorized representative asks governmental body to provide information concerning that individual). Therefore, to the extent the requestor is acting as the insured individuals' authorized representative, the city must withhold the information we marked and, with the exception of the information pertaining to the insured individuals, the information you marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. To the extent the requestor is not acting as the insured individuals' authorized representative, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked and the information you marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *Id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c) of the Government Code. Accordingly, the city must withhold the e-mail address you marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the e-mail address affirmatively consents to its disclosure.

Section 552.147 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the social security number of a living person. *Id.* § 552.147. Upon review, we agree the city may withhold the social security number you marked under section 552.147 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the city holds the grand jury subpoena and information obtained through the grand jury subpoena solely as an agent of the grand jury, such information consists of records of the judiciary that are not subject to disclosure under the Act, and the city is not required to release that information in response to the instant request. The city must release the CR-3 accident report to the requestor in its entirety pursuant to section 550.065(c) of the Transportation Code. The city must withhold the submitted body worn camera video recordings under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.661(f) of the Occupations Code. The city must withhold the fingerprints you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The city must withhold the public citizens’ dates of birth you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the requestor is not acting as the insured individuals’ authorized representative, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked and the information you marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the e-mail address you marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the e-mail address affirmatively consents to its disclosure. The city may withhold the social security number you marked under section 552.147 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, 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'KH' followed by a stylized flourish.

Kieran Hillis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KH/jxd

Ref: ID# 765948

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)