



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 23, 2020

Mr. Robert Carroll  
Senior Assistant City Attorney  
City of Odessa  
P. O. Box 7398  
Odessa, Texas 79760-4398

OR2020-08983

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# 817662 (PIR# P002060).

The City of Odessa (the "city") received a request for specified video recordings. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

We note some of the information you have submitted is not responsive to the request because it does not consist the requested video recordings. 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.

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. 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. Occ. Code § 1701.661(a). Upon our review of the submitted information, we determine the requestor provided the requisite information required by section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code. However, section 1701.661(f) provides, in relevant part:

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the city does not cite to section 552.108 of the Government Code in its brief, we understand the city to raise this section based on the substance of its argument.

A law enforcement agency may not release any portion of a recording made in a private space . . . without written authorization from the person who is the subject of that portion of the recording or, if the person is deceased, from the person's authorized representative.

*Id.* § 1701.661(f). Upon review, we find portions of the body worn camera recordings were made in private spaces. *See id.* § 1701.651(3) (defining “private space” for purposes of section 1701.661(f)). The city states it does not have permission for release from all of the subjects or the necessary authorized representative of the deceased subject of the recordings made in the private spaces. *See id.* § 1701.661(f). Accordingly, we find the city must withhold the information we indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.661(f) of the Occupations Code. However, we find no portion of the remaining body worn camera recordings were made in a private space. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining body worn camera recordings under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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. *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.). 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 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 § 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 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the internal records and notations of law enforcement agencies and prosecutors when their release would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989) (quoting *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977)). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706. Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect “information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize

officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State.” See *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has concluded section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. See, e.g., Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 of the Government Code is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). Section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable, however, to generally known policies and procedures. See, e.g., ORDs 531 at 2–3 (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

The city states portions of the remaining recordings are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108(b). Although the city states that release of this information would “reveal law enforcement crime prevention techniques[,]” the city has not marked or otherwise specifically identified any such information. See Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(2) (governmental body must label copy of requested information to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the information). Therefore, we find the city has failed to demonstrate release of any portion of the remaining recordings would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining recordings under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

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.<sup>2</sup> See *id.* § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold all visible license plate images and registration stickers in the remaining recordings under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.661(f) of the Occupations Code. The city must withhold all living public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold all visible license plate images and registration stickers in the remaining recordings 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

---

<sup>2</sup> 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).

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,

Emily Kunst  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

EK/gw

Ref: ID# 817662

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)