



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 7, 2020

Ms. Leslie A. Whitten
Assistant City Attorney
City of College Station
P.O. Box 9960
College Station, Texas 77842

OR2020-19718

Dear Ms. Whitten:

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# 842129 (Ref. No. A20-001027).

The City of College Station (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information consists of city police officers' body worn camera recordings. 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 recordings at issue pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released.¹ 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 remaining information contains a court-filed document that is 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 document, 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 have 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 document 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 argument for the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

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 remaining information relates to an ongoing criminal investigation. 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 DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms have previously been provided to the arrestee. Because copies of these documents have previously been released to the arrestee, we find

¹ As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your argument against disclosure of this information.

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 basic information and the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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.”² 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 date of birth in the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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 driver's license state and number in the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, as the requestor 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 basic information and the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. In releasing the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms, the city must withhold the date of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the driver's license state and number under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

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

² The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions 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,

Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/be

Ref: ID# 842129

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)