



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 28, 2019

Mr. Vance Hinds
Assistant Ellis County & District Attorney
Ellis County
109 South Jackson
Waxahachie, Texas 75165

OR2019-24093

Dear Mr. Hinds:

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# 783122.

The Ellis County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") received a request for all records related to a specified case. You claim a portion of the submitted information was not properly requested under chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. You also claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.117, 552.130, 552.1325, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you note, and we agree the submitted information includes police 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:

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 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released.¹ 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).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts 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 information that is made confidential by statute. Section 261.201(a) of the Family Code provides as follows:

(a) The following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Upon review, we find the remaining information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect. *See id.* §§101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). Thus, based on our review, we find the remaining information is within the scope of section 261.201 of the Family Code. We have no indication the district attorney’s office has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information. Therefore, we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, the district attorney’s office must generally withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section

¹ As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

261.201 of the Family Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

We note the remaining information includes a CR-3 accident report. Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information 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. 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).

In this instance, we have no indication the requestor is a person listed under section 550.065(c). Thus, the submitted accident report is confidential under section 550.065(b), and the district attorney's office must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code. However, section 550.065(c-1) requires the district attorney's office to create a redacted accident report that may be requested by any person. *Id.* § 550.065(c-1). The redacted accident report may not include the information listed in subsection (f)(2). *Id.* Therefore, the requestor has a right of access to the redacted accident report. Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy for some of the information at issue, we note a statutory right of access prevails over the common law. *See CenterPoint 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). Thus, no portion of the redacted accident report may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

You also assert section 552.130 of the Government Code for some of the motor vehicle record information contained in the redacted 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-1) of the Transportation Code for the redacted 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-1) specifically provides access only to redacted 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 redacted accident report provided under section 550.065(c-1) is more specific than the general confidentiality provided under section 552.130. Therefore, the district attorney's office may not withhold any portion of the redacted accident report under section 552.130. Accordingly, the district attorney's office must release the redacted accident report to the requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c-1) of the Transportation Code.

Nevertheless, there is a conflict between the confidentiality provided under section 261.201 of the Family Code and the right of access provided under section 550.065(c) of the Transportation Code. Where general and specific statutes are in irreconcilable conflict, the specific provision typically prevails as an exception to the general provision unless the general provision was enacted later and there is clear evidence the legislature intended the general provision to prevail. *See* Gov't Code § 311.026(b); *City of Lake Dallas v. Lake Cities Mun. Util. Auth.*, 555 S.W. 2d 163. 168 (Tex. Civ. App.—Fort Worth 1977, writ ref'd n.r.e.). In this instance, although section 261.201 generally pertains to all records of alleged child abuse or neglect, section 550.065(c) specifically pertains to accident reports. Thus, we find section 550.065 is more specific than, and prevails over, section 261.201. Therefore, the district attorney's office must release the redacted CR-3 accident report to the requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c-1) of the Transportation Code. The district attorney's office must withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.²

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 district attorney's office must release the redacted CR-3 accident report to the requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c-1) of the Transportation Code. The district attorney's office must withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

Mr. Vance Hinds - Page 5

charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Emily Buchanan". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letter of the first name being a large, stylized 'E'.

Emily Buchanan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EBO/eb

Ref: ID# 783122

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)