



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 22, 2020

Ms. Ms. Cynthia Tynan
Senior Attorney & Public Information Coordinator
Office of General Counsel
The University of Texas System
210 West 7th Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2901

OR2020-16354

Dear Ms. Tynan:

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# 833001 (OGC# 196585).

The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center (the "university") received a request for six categories of information related to a specified incident. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You state you do not possess information responsive to two categories of information listed in the request.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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 information made confidential by other statutes. 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:

¹ The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request, create responsive information, or obtain information that is not held by the governmental body or on its behalf. See *Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 555 at 1 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

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 submitted information contains a university police officer's body worn camera recording. We note the requestor provided the information required by section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code for release of the body worn camera recording at issue. The submitted recording reflects it was required to be made by law or the policies of the university and relate to a law enforcement purpose. *See id.* 1701.661(h). We note, however, section 1701.661(c) and section 1701.661(d) provide:

(c) Except as provided by Subsection (d), information recorded by a body worn camera and held by a law enforcement agency under this subchapter is not subject to the requirements of Section 552.021, Government Code.

(d) Information that is or could be used as evidence in a criminal prosecution is subject to the requirement of Section 552.021, Government Code.

Id. § 1701.661(c)-(d). You state the body worn camera recording relates to an incident that is not related to a criminal offense. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the body worn camera recording at issue could not be used as evidence in a criminal prosecution. *See id.* § 1701.661(d). Therefore, we conclude the body worn camera recording at issue is not confidential under section 1701.661(c) of the Occupations Code and the university may not withhold this recording under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 418.182 of the Government Code, which was added to chapter 418 of the Government Code as part of the Texas Homeland Security Act (the "HSA"). Section 418.182(a) of the Government Code provides, in part, the following:

[I]nformation . . . in the possession of a governmental entity that relates to the specifications, operating procedures, or location of a security system used to protect public or private property from an act of terrorism or related criminal activity is confidential.

Gov't Code § 418.182(a). The fact that information may be related to a security system does not make the information *per se* confidential under section 418.182. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation by a governmental body of a statute's

key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of a claimed provision. As with any confidentiality provision, a governmental body asserting section 418.182 must adequately explain how the responsive information falls within the scope of the statute. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies).

You explain the some of the submitted information consists of a video recording from a surveillance camera that is part of the university's security system and used to protect public property from an act of terrorism or related criminal activity. You state release of this information would reveal vulnerabilities in the surveillance system by disclosing camera locations and angles, video quality and clarity, and surveillance coverage and capabilities. Based upon these representations and our review of the information at issue, we conclude you have demonstrated the information at issue falls within the scope of section 418.182(a). Accordingly, the university must withhold the submitted surveillance camera recording under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182(a) of the Government Code. *See generally* *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Abbott*, 310 S.W.3d 670 (Tex. App.—Austin 2010, no pet.) (case construing section 418.182 of the HSA, which ruled recorded images necessarily relate to specifications of security system that recorded them).

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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 545 (1990) (common-law privacy protects mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). The court of appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code. *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.). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the university must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth and the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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.² *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the university must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the university must withhold: (1) the submitted surveillance camera recording under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 418.182(a) of the Government Code; (2) all public citizens' dates of birth and the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; and (3) the information we have indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The university 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/jlbm

Ref: ID# 833001

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

² 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).