



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 18, 2020

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

OR2020-04924

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# 811550 (ORR# P001793).

The City of Odessa (the "city") received one request for basic information pertaining to a specified fatality investigation, and a second request for all information from that investigation (the "second requestor"). The city states it will withhold information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> The city also states it has released some of the requested information, but claims the submitted information is either not subject to release pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code or excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. The city informs us, and provides documentation showing, it notified a family member of the deceased individual of the city's receipt of the request for information and of that individual's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released.<sup>2</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should

---

<sup>1</sup> 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).

<sup>2</sup> As of the date of this letter, this office has not received comments from any third party explaining why any of the submitted information should not be released.

not be released). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

The submitted information includes body worn camera recordings of city police officers. 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 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). The second requestor did not give the requisite information under section 1701.661(a). As this requestor did not properly request the body worn camera recordings at issue pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach these recordings and the city is not required to release them to him. 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 excepts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses the informer’s privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. *Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). The informer’s privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided the subject of the information does not already know the informer’s identity. *See* Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer’s privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to “administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres.” Open Records Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). The privilege excepts the informer’s statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer’s identity. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990). However, witnesses who provide information

in the course of an investigation but do not make a report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer's privilege. Upon review, we find the city has not established the informer's privilege is applicable to the information at issue. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground.

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 the *Industrial Foundation* decision. *Id.* at 683. 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.). Nevertheless, because “the right of privacy is purely personal[,]” that right “terminates upon the death of the person whose privacy is invaded[.]” *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref'd n.r.e.); *see also Justice v. Belo Broad. Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 147 (N.D. Tex. 1979) (“action for invasion of privacy can be maintained only by a living individual whose privacy is invaded” (quoting Restatement (Second) of Torts § 6521 (1977))); Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) (“the right of privacy lapses upon death”), H-917 (1976) (“We are . . . of the opinion that the Texas courts would follow the almost uniform rule of other jurisdictions that the right of privacy lapses upon death.”); Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981) (“the right of privacy is personal and lapses upon death”). The city must withhold the submitted dates of birth of living persons under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find none of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in the *Industrial Foundation* decision. Accordingly, the remaining information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that ground. Therefore, the city must release the remaining information.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c).<sup>3</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue does not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c), and the city does not inform us a member of the public has affirmatively

---

<sup>3</sup> The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 at 2 (1987), 480 at 5 (1987).

consented to its release. Therefore, the city must withhold the e-mail address of a member of the public in the remaining information under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, because the requestors did not properly request the submitted body worn camera recordings pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach the body worn camera recordings at issue and the city is not required to release them to the second requestor. The city must withhold the submitted dates of birth of living persons under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must also withhold the e-mail address of a member of the public in the remaining information under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.<sup>4</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 <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,

  
James L. Coggeshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLC/jxd

Ref: ID# 811550

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 3 Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>4</sup> We note the information at issue contains social security numbers. 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 under the Act. Gov't Code § 552.147(b).