



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 28, 2020

Ms. Andrea D. Russell
Counsel for the City of Boerne
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam LLP
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2020-24322

Dear Ms. Russell:

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# 847084.

The City of Boerne (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all information pertaining to the requestor or two named individuals, including a specified incident. The city states it is withholding motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ The city further states it is withholding certain information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).² The city argues some of the submitted information was not properly requested pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. The city claims the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

¹ Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

² Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

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 provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) 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 it need not be released. 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).

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 protected by section 48.101 of the Human Resources Code. Section 48.101 provides in relevant part:

(a) The following information is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act]:

- (1) a report of abuse, neglect, or exploitation made under this chapter;
- (2) the identity of the person making the report; and
- (3) except as provided by this section, all files, reports, records, communications, and working papers used or developed in an investigation made under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

(b) Confidential information may be disclosed only for a purpose consistent with this chapter and as provided by [the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (the “DFPS”)] or investigating state agency rule and applicable federal law.

Hum. Res. Code § 48.101. The city argues the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 48.101 because the report documents that a referral was made to the Adult Protective Services division of the Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (“DFPS”). The only entities authorized to conduct an investigation under chapter 48 of the Human Resources Code are the DFPS and certain other state agencies, depending on the circumstances surrounding the incident. *See id.* §§ 48.151, .152, .252, .301. Upon review, we find the information at issue reflects it was created by the city’s police department pursuant to its own investigation. Further, we have no indication the information was used or developed in an investigation under chapter 48 of the Human Resources Code. Consequently, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 48.101 of the Human Resources 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. 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). The Third 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.). Upon review, we agree the information the city marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the submitted body worn camera recordings were not properly requested pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code and they need not be released. The city must withhold the information it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must release the remaining information to this requestor.³

³ 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 city receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a decision from this office.

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,

Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/be

Ref: ID# 847084

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)