



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 20, 2019

Ms. Tangerla Williams
Temporary Senior Assistant General Counsel
Dallas Area Rapid Transit
P.O. Box 660163
Dallas, Texas 75266-0163

OR2019-16843

Dear Ms. Williams:

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# 771490 (DART ORR # W003756-032719).

The Dallas Area Rapid Transit ("DART") received a request for information pertaining to a specified time period and a specified incident involving the requestor.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.111 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

¹You state DART sought and received clarification of the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify 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).

²Although you also raise Texas Rule of Evidence 503, we note the proper exceptions to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is section 552.107 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002), 676 at 1-2.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is not responsive to the present request because it does not pertain to the specified incident or the time period requested by the requestor. This ruling does not address the public availability of the non-responsive information, which we have marked and indicated, and DART need not release it in response to this request.

Next, we must address the procedural obligations of DART under the Act. Section 552.301 of the Government Code describes the procedural obligations placed on a governmental body that receives a written request for information it wishes to withhold. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), the governmental body must ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days after receiving the request. *See Gov't Code* § 552.301(a), (b). You state DART received the clarified request for information on March 29, 2019. Accordingly, DART's ten-business-day deadline was April 12, 2019. However, you did not request a ruling from this office until April 15, 2019. *See id.* § 552.308 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail). Although you inform us DART "lost internet service" on April 12, 2019, we note the ten-business-day deadline to request an attorney general's decision is statutorily imposed on DART by section 552.301(b), and this office is required to adhere to this provision when determining the timeliness of the submissions made by DART for purposes of requesting a ruling under the Act. *See id.* §§ 552.301, .302, .306. Additionally, we note a governmental body may not decline to comply with the requirements of the Act on the ground of administrative inconvenience. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 687 (Tex. 1976). Therefore, we conclude DART failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301(b) in requesting this decision from our office.

Nevertheless, we note the responsive information includes an officer's body worn camera recordings. Body worn cameras are subject to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, which provides the procedures a requestor must follow when seeking a body worn camera recording. Section 1701.661(a) reads as follows:

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). Upon review of the responsive information, we determine the requestor provided the information required by section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code

for release of the body worn camera recordings at issue. Section 1701.662(a) of the Occupations Code reads as follows:

Notwithstanding Section 552.301(b), Government Code, a governmental body's request for a decision from the attorney general about whether a requested body worn camera recording falls within an exception to public disclosure is considered timely if made not later than the *20th business day* after the date of receipt of the written request.

Id. § 1701.662(a) (emphasis added). Accordingly, the 20th-business-day deadline for the body worn camera recordings was April 26, 2019. Thus, notwithstanding DART's failure to comply with section 552.301(b), we find DART timely requested a decision to withhold the submitted body worn camera recordings in accordance with section 1701.662(a). Accordingly, we will address your argument against disclosure of the body worn camera recordings under section 552.108. However, with respect to the remaining information, pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). DART claims sections 552.108 and 552.111 of the Government Code for the remaining information. However, we find you have failed to establish a compelling reason to address your claims under sections 552.108 and 552.111 for this information. Accordingly, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.108 or section 552.111. However, sections 552.101 and 552.107 can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness. Therefore, we will also address your arguments under sections 552.101 and 552.107 for the responsive information. Further, because sections 552.117 and 552.130 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address the applicability of these sections to the responsive information.³

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). Generally, 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 body worn camera recordings relate to an ongoing criminal investigation, and release of that information would interfere with the investigation of the case. Based upon this representation, we conclude the release of the body worn camera recordings would interfere

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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 information at issue. Therefore, you may withhold the body worn camera recordings under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government 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 exception encompasses the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (the “ADA”). *See* 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.* Title I of the ADA provides that information about the medical conditions and medical histories of applicants or employees must be (1) collected and maintained on separate forms, (2) kept in separate medical files, and (3) treated as a confidential medical record. Information obtained in the course of a “fitness for duty examination” conducted to determine whether an employee is still able to perform the essential functions of his or her job is to be treated as a confidential medical record as well. *See* 29 C.F.R. § 1630.14(c); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 641 (1996). Furthermore, the federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (the “EEOC”) has determined that medical information for the purposes of the ADA includes “specific information about an individual’s disability and related functional limitations, as well as general statements that an individual has a disability or that an ADA reasonable accommodation has been provided for a particular individual.” *See* Letter from Ellen J. Vargyas, Legal Counsel, EEOC, to Barry Kearney, Associate General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, 3 (Oct. 1, 1997). Federal regulations define “disability” for the purposes of the ADA as “(1) a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more of the major life activities of the individual; (2) a record of such an impairment; or (3) being regarded as having such an impairment.” 29 C.F.R. § 1630.2(g). The regulations further provide that physical or mental impairment means: (1) any physiological disorder, or condition, cosmetic disfigurement, or anatomical loss affecting one or more of the following body systems: neurological, musculoskeletal, special sense organs, respiratory (including speech organs), cardiovascular, reproductive, digestive, genito-urinary, hemic and lymphatic, skin, and endocrine; or (2) any mental or psychological disorder, such as mental retardation, organic brain syndrome, emotional or mental illness, and specific learning disabilities. *See id.* § 1630.2(h). Upon review, we conclude you failed to demonstrate the ADA is applicable to any portion of the remaining information and none of it may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is

involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, *id.*, meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *See Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You state the information you marked consists of communications between a DART attorney and DART employees that were made for the purpose of providing legal services to DART. You state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information you marked consists of privileged attorney-client communications. Therefore, DART may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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 Third 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, DART must withhold the public citizens’ dates of birth we have marked and indicated 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. *See Gov’t Code* § 552.130. Accordingly, DART must

withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *Id.* § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.117(a)(1) also applies to the personal cellular telephone number of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Therefore, if the employee whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, DART must withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, if the employee at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024 or the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body, DART may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1).

In summary, DART may withhold the body worn camera recordings under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. DART may withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. DART must withhold the public citizens' dates of birth we have marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. DART must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. To the extent the employee whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, DART must withhold the cellular telephone number we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. DART must release the remaining responsive information.⁴

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.

⁴We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(b) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on grounds that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself).

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 that reads "Erin Groff". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/gw

Ref: ID# 771490

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)