



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 8, 2020

Mr. Jeremy R. Page
Counsel for the City of Lancaster
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2020-17040

Dear Mr. Page:

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# 835463 (ORR# W015549).

The Lancaster Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for information related to case number 2020-033451. The department states it is releasing some of the requested information. The department claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the department claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure 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. The department asserts, and we agree, the submitted video recordings contain confidential motor vehicle record information that is excepted from disclosure under section 552.130. In this instance, the department states it does not possess the technological capability to redact information from video files. Thus, we agree the department must withhold the entireties of the submitted video recordings under section 552.130 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 364 (1983). The department must also withhold the motor vehicle record information it marked, and the additional motor vehicle record information we marked, under section 552.130 of the Government Code. However, the submitted 9-1-1 audio recording does not contain motor vehicle record information subject to section

552.130, and the department may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.”¹ Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 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. This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *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). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information, which we marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the department must withhold the entireties of the submitted video recordings and the additional marked motor vehicle record information under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must release the remaining information to this requestor.²

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

¹ 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).

² We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a) (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); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Thus, if the department receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the department must again seek a decision from this office.

Mr. Jeremy R. Page - Page 3

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,

Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/rm

Ref: ID# 835463

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)