



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 4, 2020

Ms. Bridget Chapman  
Assistant District Attorney – Civil Division  
Williamson County District Attorney’s Office  
405 M.L.K. Street, Box 1  
Georgetown, Texas 78626

OR2020-22439

Dear Ms. Chapman:

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# 843204.

The Williamson County District Attorney’s Office (the “district attorney’s office”) received a request for information pertaining to certain types of cases. You state the district attorney’s office is withholding certain information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).<sup>1</sup> You claim some of the submitted information was not properly requested pursuant to section 1701.661 of the Occupations Code. You also claim some the submitted information is not subject to the Act. Additionally, you claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, 552.117, 552.1175, 552.119, and 552.130 of the Government Code and privileged under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence.<sup>2</sup> We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

<sup>2</sup> Although you also raise section 552.022 of the Government Code, we note this section is not an exception to disclosure. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.022 (enumerating categories of information that are not excepted from disclosure unless they are made confidential under the Act or other law).

<sup>3</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.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes 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 provide the requisite information under section 1701.661(a). As the body worn camera recordings at issue were not properly requested pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information and the district attorney's office need not release it. However, pursuant to section 1701.661(b), a "failure to provide all the information required by [s]ubsection (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, you state the submitted information includes grand jury records, including grand jury subpoenas and information obtained pursuant to grand jury subpoenas. The judiciary is expressly excluded from the requirements of the Act. Gov't Code § 552.003(1)(B). This office has determined for purposes of the Act, a grand jury is a part of the judiciary and, therefore, not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 411 (1984). Further, records kept by a governmental body that is acting as an agent for a grand jury are considered records in the constructive possession of the grand jury, and are also not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 513 (1988), 411, 398 (1983). The fact that information collected or prepared by another person or entity is submitted to the grand jury does not necessarily mean such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession when the same information also is held in the other person's or entity's own capacity. Information held by another person or entity but not produced at the direction of the grand jury may well be protected under one of the Act's specific exceptions to disclosure, but such information is not excluded from the reach of the Act by the judiciary exclusion. *See* ORD 513. You state the information you marked consists of records of a grand jury, "which [are] being held by the [district attorney's office] acting as an agent for the grand jury." Based on these representations, we understand the district attorney's office holds the information at issue solely as an agent of the grand jury. Accordingly, the information you

marked consists of judicial records that are not subject to the Act, and the district attorney's office need not release such information in response to the present request.<sup>4</sup>

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 . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime.” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, 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 information at issue pertains to ongoing criminal investigations conducted by the district attorney’s office. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the information at issue.

However, we note section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov’t Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Accordingly, with the exception of the basic information, the district attorney’s office may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>5</sup>

We understand you seek to withhold the entirety of the basic information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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 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. However, we note the public has a legitimate interest in the details of a crime. *See* Open Records Decision No. 400 at 4 (1983); *see generally Lowe v. Hearst Communications, Inc.*, 487 F.3d 246, 250 (5th Cir. 2007) (noting “legitimate public interest in facts tending to support an

---

<sup>4</sup> As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

<sup>5</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information, except to note basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle* is generally not excepted from public disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Open Records Decision No. 597 (1991).

allegation of criminal activity” (citing *Cinel v. Connick*, 15 F.3d 1338, 1345-46 (5th Cir. 1994)). We also note the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 542 (1990), 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the district attorney’s office may not withhold any portion of the basic information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Additionally, we understand you seek to withhold the entirety of the basic information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with 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. ORD 455 at 4. 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 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the basic information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual’s privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the district attorney’s office may not withhold any portion of the basic information under section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

In summary, as the body worn camera recordings at issue were not properly requested pursuant to section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information and the district attorney’s office need not release it. The judicial records you marked are not subject to the Act and the district attorney’s office need not release such information in response to the present request. With the exception of the basic information, which must be released, the district attorney’s office may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) 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 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,

Blake Brennan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BBX/mo

Ref: ID# 843204

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)