



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 10, 2019

Mr. Lance Kennedy
Counsel for the City of Balch Springs
Messer, Rockefeller & Fort, PLLC
6371 Preston Road, Suite 200
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2019-15410

Dear Mr. Kennedy:

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# 769686 (ORR ID Nos. B040819AW and B031819AW).

The City of Balch Springs (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident.¹ You state the city has released some information to the requestor. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information, some of which consists of a representative sample.² We have also received and considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit written comments regarding why information should or should not be released).

¹We note the requestor modified his request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purposes of clarifying or narrowing request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S. W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

²We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Initially, we note, and you acknowledge, the submitted information contains peace 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(a) of the Occupations Code provides the following:

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 under section 1701.661(a) for one of the body worn camera recordings at issue. As this body worn camera recording was properly requested pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, we will consider your arguments against its disclosure. However, because the requestor did not properly request the remaining body worn camera recordings, which we indicated, pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released to the requestor.³ We note, pursuant to section 1701.661(b), a "failure to provide all the information required by [s]ubsection (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).

Next, we note the remaining information includes CR-3 accident reports that are 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

³As we are able to make this determination, we need not address the arguments against disclosure of this information.

(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 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 for the information at issue, we note a specific statutory right of access overcomes the common law. *See 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). Therefore, no portion of the submitted accident reports may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

Additionally, you assert the motor vehicle record information within the accident reports is confidential under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 excepts from disclosure information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title, or registration issued by an agency of this state or another state or country. *See Gov't Code* § 552.130(a)(1)-(2). 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 reports at issue. 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). 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 reports provided under section 550.065(c) is more specific than the general confidentiality provided under section 552.130. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the accident reports under section 552.130. Accordingly, the city must release the submitted accident reports pursuant to section 550.065(c) of the Transportation Code.

Section 552.108(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]" *Gov't Code* § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A);

see also Ex parte Pruitt, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state the information at issue relates to a pending criminal investigation or prosecution. However, the requestor asserts the information at issue relates to an investigation that is now closed. Whether the information at issue relates to a pending criminal investigation is a question of fact. Open Records Decision Nos. 592 at 2 (1991), 552 at 4 (1990), 435 at 4 (1986). This office is unable to resolve disputes of fact in the open records ruling process. Accordingly, we must rely upon the facts alleged to us by the governmental body requesting our opinion, or upon those facts that are discernible from the documents submitted for our inspection. *See* ORD 552 at 4. Thus, based upon the city's representation, we conclude the release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the remaining information at issue.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure “basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.” *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Accordingly, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.⁴

In summary, as the body worn camera recordings we indicated were not properly requested pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released. The city must release the submitted accident reports pursuant to section 550.065(c) of the Transportation Code. With the exception of basic information, which you state the city has released, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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 "James M. Graham". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "James" being the most prominent.

James M. Graham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JMG/eb

Ref: ID# 769686

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)