



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 1, 2020

Ms. Judy Hickman
Assistant Supervisor
Beaumont Police Department
P.O. Box 3827
Beaumont, Texas 77704

OR2020-24793

Dear Ms. Hickman:

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# 846801.

The Beaumont Police Department (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to a specified accident and a specified audit. You state the department will release some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit, a motor vehicle title or registration, or a personal identification document issued by an agency of Texas or another state or country is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find some of the submitted video recordings contain information subject to section 552.130. You state the department does not have the technological capability to redact the motor vehicle record information from the recordings. Accordingly, the department must withhold the recordings we indicated in their entirety under section 552.130.² *See* Open Records Decision No. 364

¹ Although you also raise section 552.108 of the Government Code for the submitted information, you provide no arguments explaining how this exception is applicable to the information at issue. Therefore, we assume you no longer assert this exception. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure, and we do not address the applicability of section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code to the video recordings at issue. *See generally* Occ. Code § 1701.661(a), (e).

(1983). However, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining recordings at issue contain information that is subject to section 552.130. Thus, the department may not withhold any of the remaining recordings under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

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 information protected by other statutes, such as 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. Section 418.182 provides in part:

(a) Except as provided by Subsections (b) and (c), information, including access codes and passwords, 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.

Id. § 418.182(a). The fact information may generally 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). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information consists of access codes or passwords that relate 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. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

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. Upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern. Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses 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. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). 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 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). After review of the remaining information, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any portion of the information at issue falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on the basis of constitutional privacy.

In summary, the department must withhold the recordings we indicated in their entirety under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The department 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,

Emily Kunst
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EK/gw

Ref: ID# 846801

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)