



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 11, 2019

Ms. Chelsey Heil  
Records Supervisor  
City of Leander  
705 Leander Drive  
Leander, Texas 78641

OR2019-18835

Dear Ms. Heil:

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# 774682.

The Leander Police Department (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to a specified arrest.<sup>1</sup> You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.108 and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information consists of 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) provides:

---

<sup>1</sup>We note the department asked for and received clarification regarding this request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information); *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

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 does not give the requisite information under section 1701.661(a). As the requestor did not properly request the body worn camera recordings at issue pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released.<sup>2</sup> However, pursuant to section 1701.661(b), a “failure to provide all the information required by Subsection (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 portions of the remaining video recordings are subject to article 2.1396 of the Code of Criminal Procedure with respect to the first requestor. Article 2.1396 provides:

A person stopped or arrested on suspicion of an offense under Section 49.04, 49.045, 49.07, or 49.08, Penal Code, is entitled to receive from a law enforcement agency employing the peace officer who made the stop or arrest a copy of any video made by or at the direction of the officer that contains footage of:

- (1) the stop;
- (2) the arrest;
- (3) the conduct of the person stopped during any interaction with the officer, including during the administration of a field sobriety test; or
- (4) a procedure in which a specimen of the person’s breath or blood is taken.

Crim. Proc. Code art. 2.1396. We note portions of the remaining video recordings were made by or at the direction of a peace officer employed by the department and contain footage of the requestor being stopped on suspicion of an offense under section 49.04 of the Penal Code. *See* Penal Code § 49.04 (“A person commits an offense if the person is

---

<sup>2</sup>As we are able to make this determination, we need not address the arguments against disclosure of this information.

intoxicated while operating a motor vehicle in a public place.”). Therefore, the requestor is entitled to receive copies of these portions of the video recordings pursuant to article 2.1396. Although you assert the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code, a statutory right of access prevails over the Act’s general exceptions to public disclosure and 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); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 623 at 3 (1994) (exceptions in the Act generally inapplicable to information that statutes expressly make public), 613 at 4 (1993) (exceptions in Act cannot impinge in statutory right of access to information), 451 (1986) (specific statutory right of access provisions overcome general exceptions to disclosure under the Act). Therefore, the department may not withhold any portion of the video recordings at issue that depict the stop, the arrest, or the conduct of the requestor during interactions with the officers, or a procedure in which a specimen of the requestor’s blood or breath was taken under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides 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 is excepted from public release. Gov’t Code § 552.130(a). As noted above, a statutory right of access generally prevails over the Act’s general exceptions to disclosure. *See* ORD 613 at 4, 451. 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 article 2.1396 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Where information falls within both a general and a specific provision of law, the specific provision prevails over the general. *See* Gov’t Code § 311.026(b); *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). In this instance, section 552.130 generally excepts motor vehicle record information maintained in any context, while article 2.1396 specifically provides access to certain video footage pertaining to certain intoxication offense arrests. Thus, we conclude the access under article 2.1396 is more specific than the general confidentiality provided under section 552.130. Additionally, we note article 2.1396 is the later enacted statute. *See* Gov’t Code § 311.025(a) (if statutes enacted at different sessions of legislature are irreconcilable, statute latest in enactment prevails). Accordingly, the department may not withhold any portion of the video recordings at issue from the requestor under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Therefore, the department must release the portions of the video recordings that depict the stop, the arrest, or the conduct of the requestor during interactions with the officers, or a procedure in which a specimen of the requestor’s blood or breath was taken. However, we will address your arguments against disclosure of the remaining video recordings at issue for the first requestor and all recordings for the remaining requestors.

Next, we note the remaining information includes court-filed documents. Section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code provides for required public disclosure of

“information that is also contained in a public court record[,]” unless the information is expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(17). Although you seek to withhold this information under section 552.108 of the Government Code, this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body’s interests and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). Therefore, you may not withhold the court-filed documents, which we have marked, under section 552.108. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure of this information, the department must release the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. We will also address your argument against disclosure of the remaining information not subject to section 552.022(a)(17).

We note the remaining information includes the results of an analysis of a blood specimen. Section 724.018 of the Transportation Code provides, “[o]n the request of a person who has given a specimen at the request of a peace officer, full information concerning the analysis of the specimen shall be made available to the person or the person’s attorney.” Transp. Code § 724.018. We note the requestor is the person who provided the specimen at the request of a peace officer. Although you claim this information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code, we note a specific right of access provision prevails over the Act’s general exceptions to disclosure. *See* ORD 451 at 4 (specific statutory right of access provisions overcome general exceptions to disclosure under statutory predecessor to Act). Therefore, the submitted results of the analysis of the blood specimen must be released to the requestor pursuant to section 724.018 of the Transportation Code.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides the following:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime;

(2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication;

(3) it is information relating to a threat against a peace officer or detention officer collected or disseminated under Section 411.048; or

(4) it is information that:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

(b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution is exempted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution;

(2) the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication; or

(3) the internal record or notation:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)-(b). A governmental body raising section 552.108 must explain the applicability of section 552.108. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). The department generally raises section 552.108 for some of the submitted information. A governmental body claiming subsection 552.108(a)(1) or subsection 552.108(b)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* § 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You do not inform us the information at issue pertains to a specific ongoing criminal investigation or prosecution, nor have you explained release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. Thus, the department has failed to demonstrate the applicability of subsection 552.108(a)(1) or subsection 552.108(b)(1). A governmental body claiming subsection 552.108(a)(2) or subsection 552.108(b)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2), (b)(2). You have not demonstrated the information at issue pertains to any specific investigation that concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. Thus, the department has failed to demonstrate the applicability of either subsection 552.108(a)(2) or subsection 552.108(b)(2). Subsection 552.108(a)(3) is also inapplicable as the information does not relate to a threat against a police officer. *See id.* § 552.108(a)(3). Lastly, you do not assert the information at issue was prepared by an attorney representing the state or that it reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state. *See id.* § 552.108(a)(4), (b)(3). Thus, the department has

failed to demonstrate the applicability of either subsection 552.108(a)(4) or subsection 552.108(b)(3).

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. 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 Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See 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.). We note the requestor has a right of access to her client’s date of birth. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a) (“person or a person’s authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to 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 individual requests information concerning herself). Thus, with the exception of the requestor’s date of birth, the department must withhold all public citizens’ dates of birth 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. You assert, and we agree, the remaining portion of the video recordings contains confidential motor vehicle record information that is excepted from disclosure under section 552.130. In this instance, you state the department does not possess the technological capability to redact information from video files. Thus, we agree the department must also withhold the entirety of the remaining portion of the video recordings, which we have indicated, under section 552.130 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 364 (1983).


In summary, as the requestor did not properly request the body worn camera recordings at issue pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released. The department must release the portions of the video recordings that depict the stop, the arrest, or the conduct of the requestor during interactions with the officers, or a procedure in which a specimen of the requestor’s blood or breath was taken pursuant to article 2.1396 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The department must release the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. The submitted results of the analysis of the blood specimen must be released to the requestor pursuant to section 724.018 of the Transportation Code. With the exception of the requestor’s date of birth, the department must withhold all public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold the entirety of the remaining portion

of the video recordings, which we have indicated, under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The department must release the remaining information to the requestor.<sup>3</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.

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,

  
Jennifer Copeland  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JC/gw

Ref: ID# 774682

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>3</sup>Because the requestor has a right of access to certain information that otherwise would be excepted from release under the Act, the department must again seek a decision from this office if it receives a request for this information from a different requestor.