



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 23, 2019

Mr. M. Matthew Ribitzki
Deputy City Attorney
City of Burleson
141 West Renfro
Burleson, Texas 76028

OR2019-36420

Dear Mr. Ribitzki:

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# 804239(ORR No. 19-0205).

The City of Burleson (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You state the city is withholding motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code, 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 also state the city is withholding dates of birth pursuant to the previous determination issued in Open Records Letter No. 2016-08169 (2016).² You

¹ Section 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). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including e-mail addresses of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

² Open Records Letter No. 2016-08169 is a previous determination issued to the city authorizing it to withhold certain public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without requesting a ruling from this office.

claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we indicated, is not responsive to the instant request for information because it does not pertain to the specified incident. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the city is not required to release such information in response to this request.

Next, we must address the procedural obligations of the city under the Act. Section 552.301 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(b). Further, pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body must submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *See id.* § 552.301(e).

In this instance, you inform us the city initially responded to the requestor in reliance on the previous determination this office granted the city in Open Records Letter No. 2017-06308 (2017). Open Records Letter No. 2017-06308 authorizes the city to withhold certain information from a requestor under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code in specified circumstances without the necessity of first requesting a ruling from this office. We note, however, Open Records Letter No. 2017-06308 states the city may not rely on the previous determination unless "the city will produce the releasable information to the requestor pursuant to the requirements of the Act within five business days after the date the request for information was received[.]" You state the city did not produce information to the requestor within five business days. Thus, the city was not authorized to rely upon Open Records Letter No. 2017-06308 to withhold the information from the requestor under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Consequently, the city was required to provide the information required by sections 552.301(b) and 552.301(e) within ten and fifteen business days of the initial request, respectively. The city received the initial request for information on September 19, 2019. Thus, the city's ten-business-day deadline under section 552.301(b) was October 3, 2019, and its fifteen-business-day deadline under section 552.301(e) was October 10, 2019. However, the city did not request a ruling from this office until October 18, 2019. *See* Gov't Code § 552.308 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Consequently, we find the city failed to comply with the

requirements of section 552.301 in requesting this decision from our office with regard to the initial request. *See id.* § 552.301(b), (e).

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 id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). Because sections 552.101 and 552.136 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we address their applicability to the submitted information.³ However, we find you have failed to establish a compelling reason to address your claimed exception.

Next, we note the submitted information includes body worn camera video 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, in relevant part, the following:

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) for one of the submitted body worn camera video recordings. As the requestor did not properly request this body worn camera recording, which we indicated, pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released.⁴ 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). Further, we note the requestor provided the requisite information under section 1701.661(a) for the remaining body worn camera video

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

⁴ As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

recordings. Accordingly, the requestor properly requested a portion of the submitted body worn camera recordings, and we will consider your argument against disclosure of this information.

Next, we note the submitted information includes a CR-3 accident report that is 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. *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). 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). Here, the requestor is a person listed under section 550.065(c). Thus, the city must release the accident report to the requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c) of the Transportation Code.

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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code, which is applicable to information relating to the provision of emergency medical services ("EMS") and provides in pertinent part:

(b) Records of the identity, evaluation or treatment of a patient by [EMS] personnel or by a physician providing medical supervision that are created by the [EMS] personnel or physician or maintained by an [EMS] provider are confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) Any person who receives information from confidential communications or records as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 773.092 who is acting on the survivor's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was obtained.

Health & Safety Code § 773.091(b)-(c). However, section 773.091 further provides:

(g) The privilege of confidentiality under this section does not extend to information regarding the presence, nature of injury or illness, age, sex, occupation, and city of residence of a patient who is receiving [EMS].

Id. § 773.091(g); *see id.* § 773.003(8) (defining EMS for purposes of chapter 773 of the Health and Safety Code). Upon review we find the information we marked constitutes EMS records made by EMS personnel or maintained by an EMS provider. Therefore, except for the information subject to section 773.091(g), which is not confidential under section 773.091, the city must withhold the EMS records we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part:

(a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient’s behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(a)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This office has concluded the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). We have further found when a file is created as a result of a hospital stay, all the documents in the file referring to diagnosis and treatment constitute physician-patient communications or “[r]ecords of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that are created or maintained by a physician.” Open Records Decision No. 546 (1990). Upon review, we find the information we marked constitutes records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that were created or are maintained by a physician and information obtained from a patient’s medical records. Accordingly, the city must withhold the medical records we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of

legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 545 (1990) (common-law privacy protects mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Thus, the city must withhold the information we indicated under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “Notwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Accordingly, the city must withhold the bank account and routing numbers we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, as the requestor did not properly request the body worn camera recording we indicated pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released. The city must release the accident report to the requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c) of the Transportation Code. Except for the information subject to section 773.091(g), the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 773.091 of the Health and Safety Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The city must withhold the information we indicated under Gov’t Code 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

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,



Kelly McWethy
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KM/mo

Ref: ID# 804239

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)