



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 5, 2020

Ms. Julie P. Doshier
Counsel for the City of Highland Village
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, L. L. P.
500 North Akard Street, Suite 1800
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2020-06964

Dear Ms. Doshier:

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# 822256 (File Ref. No. 2020-036-113637).

The City of Highland Village (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all records involving a named individual, including information related to a specified incident. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You indicate the city will redact social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code and certain information in accordance with Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information, portions of which consist of a representative sample.²

¹ 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* Gov't Code § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 serves a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code and biometric identifiers under section 560.003 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684.

² We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information consists of an officer's body worn camera recording. 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 give the requisite information under section 1701.661(a). As the requestor did not properly request the body worn camera recording at issue pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released.³ 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).

Next, we note the submitted information contains court-filed documents that are subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(17) provides for required public disclosure of "information that is also contained in a public court record[.]" unless it is "made confidential under [the Act] or other law[.]" Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). Although you raise section 552.108 for the submitted court-filed documents, this exception is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 177 (1977) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.108); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the city may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17), which we marked, under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Additionally, we note common-law privacy is not applicable to information contained in public records. *See Cox Broad. Corp. v. Cohn*, 420 U.S. 469, 496 (1975) (action for invasion of privacy cannot be maintained where information is in public domain); *Star-Telegram, Inc. v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54, 57 (Tex. 1992) (law cannot recall information once in public domain). Therefore, no portion of the submitted court-filed documents may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, the city must release the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. We will consider your arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

³ As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your argument against disclosure of this information.

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: (1) 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 information you have marked relates to an ongoing criminal investigation or prosecution. Generally, the release of information pertaining to an open case is presumed to interfere with the criminal investigation. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases). We note, however, the information at issue includes a DIC-24 Statutory Warning and a DIC-25 Notice of Suspension. The Statutory Warning and Notice of Suspension have previously been provided to the arrestee. Because copies of these documents have previously been released to the arrestee, we find you have not shown how release of these documents will interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). Because the remaining information at issue has not been previously released, we conclude release of this information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. Thus, we find section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the remaining information at issue. Accordingly, with the exception of the Statutory Warning and the Notice of Suspension, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.⁴

You state the city will withhold the dates of birth you have marked pursuant to Open Records Letter No. 2016-21546 (2016).⁵ 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 section 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.). Accordingly, the city must withhold the remaining date of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

⁴ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

⁵ Open Records Letter No. 2016-21546 is a previous determination authorizing the city to withhold the dates of birth of living individuals under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a) of the Government Code).

You state the city will withhold the motor vehicle record information you have marked pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.⁶ However, the remaining information contains additional unmarked motor vehicle record information. 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. Accordingly, the city must withhold the additional motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, as the requestors did not properly request the body worn camera recording at issue 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 information we have marked pursuant to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. With the exception of the Statutory Warning and the Notice of Suspension, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the remaining date of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the additional motor vehicle record information we have marked 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,



Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/jxd

⁶ 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).

Ref: ID# 822256

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)