



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 11, 2019

Ms. Alicia K. Kreh
Counsel for the Town of Flower Mound
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam, LLP
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107-4654

OR2019-25485

Dear Ms. Kreh:

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# 784865.

The Flower Mound Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for all video recordings pertaining to a specified arrest of the requestor's client. You state the department will release some information to the requestor. You also state the department will redact social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code and certain information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You claim portions of the submitted information are 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, as you acknowledge, the submitted information includes recordings subject to article 2.1396 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which 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

¹Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination issued by this office authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* ORD 684.

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. The information at issue consists of video recordings made by or at the direction of officers employed by the department that contain footage of the requestor's client being stopped or arrested on suspicion of an offense under section 49.04 of the Penal Code. Penal Code § 49.04 (person commits offense if person is intoxicated while operating motor vehicle in 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 section 552.108 to withhold the information at issue, a statutory right of access prevails over the Act's general exceptions to public 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). Because section 552.108 is a general exception under the Act, the requestor's right of statutory access under article 2.1396 prevails. Therefore, the department may not withhold any portion of the submitted video recordings that depicts the stop, the arrest, the conduct of the requestor's client, or a procedure in which a specimen of the requestor's client's blood or breath is taken under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

You state the department will redact some information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.² As previously noted, a statutory right of access generally prevails over the Act's general exceptions to disclosure. *See* ORDs 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 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, unless the general provision was enacted later and there is clear evidence that the legislature intended the

²Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e)

general provision to prevail. *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). 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 to the video recordings at issue provided 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). Therefore, the department may not withhold any portion of the information subject to article 2.1396 of the Code of Criminal Procedure under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(a)(1) 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 . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” *Id.* § 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 remaining information pertains to a pending criminal investigation and prosecution. Based upon your representation and our review, we conclude the release of the remaining information 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). Accordingly, the department may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the department must release any portion of the submitted video recordings that depicts the stop, the arrest, the conduct of the requestor’s client, or a procedure in which a specimen of the requestor’s client’s blood or breath is taken pursuant to article 2.1396 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The department 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 <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

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 "James M. Graham". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letters of the first and last names being capitalized and prominent.

James M. Graham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JMG/mo

Ref: ID# 784865

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)