



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 1, 2020

Mr. Paul E. Fulbright  
Assistant District Attorney  
Navarro County  
300 West 3rd Avenue, Suite 301  
Corsicana, Texas 75110

OR2020-09907

Dear Mr. Fulbright:

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# 819713.

The Navarro County Criminal District Attorney’s Office (the “district attorney’s office”) received a request for information related to a specified incident involving the requestor’s children, including incident reports, fire marshal reports, photographs, and video recordings.<sup>1</sup> You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.1085 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup> 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. This section encompasses chapter 352 of the Local Government Code. Subchapter B of chapter 352 pertains to the powers and duties of county fire marshals. The subchapter provides the marshal shall investigate the cause, origin, and circumstances of

---

<sup>1</sup> You state the district attorney’s office sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup> 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

fires that destroy property within the marshal's jurisdiction. Local Gov't Code § 352.013. In certain cases, such as where arson is suspected, the marshal may determine that further investigation is necessary and, in such cases, is granted subpoena powers and the authority to administer oaths and gather and preserve evidence. *Id.* § 352.015.

Section 352.017 of the Local Government Code, in relevant part, provides:

(a) In a proceeding under this subchapter, the county fire marshal may:

- (1) conduct an investigation or examination in private;
- (2) exclude a person who is not under examination; and
- (3) separate witnesses from each other until each witness is examined.

*Id.* § 352.017(a). In *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977), the Texas Supreme Court interpreted the statutory predecessor to subchapter B of Chapter 352 of the Local Government Code. The court concluded the purpose of the statute was to preclude interference with the fire marshal's law enforcement duties with respect to active investigatory records of the county fire marshal. *Id.* at 710. You state that the arson investigation is closed and no active investigation is ongoing. Accordingly, we conclude the district attorney's office may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the holding in *Pruitt* interpreting section 352.017(a) of the Local Government Code.

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. Upon review, we find the district attorney's office may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently, and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common-law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects

of human affairs.” *Id.* at 5 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). We note the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death and therefore may not be asserted solely on behalf of a deceased individual. *See 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.); Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981) (privacy rights lapse upon death). Upon review, we find the district attorney’s office may not withhold the information at issue from this requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of constitutional privacy.

Section 552.1085 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part, the following:

(c) A sensitive crime scene image in the custody of a governmental body is confidential and excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 and a governmental body may not permit a person to view or copy the image except as provided by this section. This section applies to any sensitive crime scene image regardless of the date that the image was taken or recorded.

Gov’t Code § 552.1085(c). For purposes of section 552.1085, “sensitive crime scene image” means “a photograph or video recording taken at a crime scene, contained in or part of a closed criminal case, that depicts a deceased person in a state of dismemberment, decapitation, or similar mutilation or that depicts the deceased person’s genitalia.” *See id.* § 552.1085(a)(6). Upon review, we find the district attorney’s office may not withhold the submitted photographs from this requestor under section 552.1085(c) of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s or driver’s license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country.<sup>3</sup> *See id.* § 552.130. We note section 552.130 protects personal privacy. Thus, the requestor has a right of access to her own motor vehicle record information under section 552.023 of the Government Code and it may not be withheld under section 552.130. *See id.* § 552.023(b) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person’s agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); ORD 481 at 4 (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). However, because we are unable to determine whether the information at issue belongs to the requestor, we must rule conditionally. To the extent the visible license plate belongs to the requestor, the district attorney’s office must release it under section 552.023 of the Government Code. To the extent the visible license plate does not belong to the requestor, the district attorney’s office must withhold it under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The district attorney’s office must release the remaining information.

---

<sup>3</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).

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,

Deborah Southerland  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DS/jlbm

Ref: ID# 819713

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)