



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 25, 2020

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

OR2020-06080

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# 813538 (ORR P000321).

The City of Odessa (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident report. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information consists of grand jury subpoenas. The judiciary is expressly excluded from the requirements of the Act. Gov't Code § 552.003(1)(B). This office has determined for purposes of the Act, a grand jury is a part of the judiciary and therefore not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 411 (1984). Further, records kept by a governmental body that is acting as an agent for a grand jury are considered records in the constructive possession of the grand jury, and are also not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 513 (1988), 411, 398 (1983). The fact that information collected or prepared by another person or entity is submitted to the grand jury does not necessarily mean such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession when the same information also is held in the other person's or entity's own capacity. Information held by another person or entity but not produced at the direction of the grand jury may well be protected under one of the Act's specific exceptions to disclosure, but such information is not excluded from the reach of the Act by the judiciary exclusion. *See* ORD 513. Thus, to the extent the city holds the grand jury subpoenas solely as an agent of the grand jury, such information consists of records of the judiciary that are

not subject to disclosure under the Act, and the city is not required to release that information in response to the instant request. To the extent the city holds the information at issue in its own capacity and not solely as an agent of the grand jury, we will address your argument against its disclosure.

Next, we must address the procedural obligations of the city under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. Gov't Code § 552.301(b). The city informs us it received the request for information on June 18, 2019. Accordingly, the city was required to provide the information required by section 552.301(b) by July 2, 2019. We note the city was closed for business on July 4, 2019. This office does not count the date the request was received or holidays for the purpose of calculating a governmental body's deadlines under the Act. Accordingly, the city was required to provide the information required by section 552.301(e) by July 10, 2019. However, the envelope in which the city provided the information required by sections 552.301(b) and 552.301(e) was postmarked December 11, 2019. *See id.* § 552.308(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Therefore, the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301.

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 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). Because sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address the applicability of these sections to the information at issue.<sup>1</sup> However, we find the city has failed to establish a compelling reason to address its remaining exception.

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

---

<sup>1</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).

(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 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). 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. The court of appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *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.). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). However, the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death and the common-law right to privacy does not encompass information that relates only to a deceased individual. *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 Broadcasting 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 § 652I (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”). Accordingly, information pertaining to a deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law privacy grounds. Thus, the city must withhold all living public citizens’ dates of birth and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s license, driver’s license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.130(a). We note section 552.130 protects privacy interests. Thus, the requestor has a right of access to his insured’s motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4 (privacy theories not implicated when an individual or authorized representative asks governmental body to provide information concerning that individual). Further, as previously discussed, the right of privacy is a personal right that lapses at death. *See Moore*, 589 S.W.2d at 491; Attorney General Opinions JM-229, H-917 (1976); ORD 272. Thus, section 552.130 is not applicable to the deceased individual’s motor vehicle record information. However, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the city holds the grand jury subpoenas solely as an agent of the grand jury, such information consists of records of the judiciary that are not subject to disclosure under the Act, and the city is not required to release that information in response to the instant request. The city must release the accident report to the requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c) of the Transportation Code. The city must withhold all living public citizens' dates of birth and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have indicated under section 552.130 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,



Paige Lay  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PL/gw

Ref: ID# 813538

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)