



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 20, 2019

Mr. Robert Carroll
Senior Assistant City Attorney
City of Odessa
P.O. Box 4398
Odessa, Texas 79760-4398

OR2019-36288

Dear Mr. Carroll:

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# 802920 (P001345-092719).

The City of Odessa (the "city") received a request for information related to a specified accident. You claim the requested body worn camera recordings were not properly requested pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. You also claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the requested information includes 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 provide the requisite information under section 1701.661(a) for the requested body worn camera recordings. As these body worn camera recordings 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.¹ 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 court-filed documents subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. 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 raise section 552.108 of the Government Code for this information, this is a discretionary exception and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). Therefore, the city may not withhold the court-filed documents, which we have marked, under section 552.108. We also note common-law privacy is not applicable to information contained in public court records. *See Austin Chronicle Corp. v. City of Austin*, No. 03-08-00596-CV, 2009 WL 483232 (Tex. App.—Austin Feb. 24, 2009, no pet.) (mem. op., not designated for publication); *see also Cox Broadcasting Corp. v. Cohn*, 420 U.S. 496 (1975) (action for invasion of privacy cannot be maintained where information is in public domain); *Star-Telegram v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54 (Tex. 1992) (law cannot recall information once in public domain). Therefore, the city may not withhold information contained in the court-filed documents under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, because section 552.130 of the Government Code can make information confidential under the Act, we will address the applicability of this section to the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17). We will also address your arguments against disclosure of the remaining information not subject to section 552.022(a)(17).

Next, we note the remaining information includes a CR-3 accident report that is subject to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. Section 550.065 of the Transportation Code 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).

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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, the requestor is a person listed under section 550.065(c). Although you assert section 552.108 to withhold the information, 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 statutory access under section 550.065(c) prevails, and the city may not withhold the information under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

You also assert the motor vehicle record information within the accident report 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). As noted above, a statutory right of access generally prevails over the Act's general exceptions to disclosure. *See* ORD 613 at 4. 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 report 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 report provided under section 550.065(c) is more specific than the general confidentiality provided under section 552.130. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the accident report under section 552.130. Therefore, the city must release the submitted CR-3 accident report to this requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c) of the Transportation 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[.]" 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 remaining information pertains to a pending criminal investigation. Based on this representation, we conclude section 552.108(a)(1) is generally applicable to the information at issue. *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). We note, however, the information at issue includes a DIC-24 form. The city provided copies of this form to the arrestee. You have not explained how releasing this information, which has already been seen by the arrestee, would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). Accordingly, the DIC-24 form may not be withheld under section 552.108.

Additionally, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure “basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.” *Id.* § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic “front-page” information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-187. *See also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered basic information). We note basic information does not include motor vehicle record information encompassed by section 552.130 of the Government Code or dates of birth. *See* ORD 127 at 3-4. Accordingly, with the exception of the DIC-24 form, the court-filed documents we have marked, and basic information, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.²

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 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.). Thus, the city must withhold the public citizen's date of birth in the DIC-24 form under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides that information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, as the requestor did not properly request the requested body worn camera recordings at issue pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information, and the city need not release this information to the requestor. The city must release the CR-3 accident report to this requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c) of the Transportation Code. With the exception of the DIC-24 form, the court-filed documents we have marked, and basic information, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. In releasing the DIC-24 form, the city must withhold the public citizen's date of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. In releasing the DIC-24 form

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

and the court-filed documents, the city must withhold the motor vehicle information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Finally, the city asks this office to issue a previous determination that would permit it to withhold dates of birth of public citizens under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without requesting a ruling from this office. *See id.* § 552.301(a) (allowing governmental body to withhold information subject to previous determination); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a) of the Government Code). We decline to issue such a previous determination at this time. Accordingly, 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,



Sean McCormick
Attorney
Open Records Division

SMC/eb

Ref: ID# 802920

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)