



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 22, 2020

Mr. David V. Overcash  
Counsel for the City of Princeton  
Wolfe, Tidwell & McCoy, LLP  
2591 Dallas Parkway, Suite 300  
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2020-26590

Dear Mr. Overcash:

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# 851215 (ORR# W022450).

The Princeton Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for information related to a specified motorcycle crash. The department states it is releasing some of the requested information, including the police officer's crash report pursuant to section 550.065(c) of the Transportation Code. *See* Transp. Code § 550.065(c) (providing for release of accident report to person or entity listed under this subsection). The department claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions the department claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the department has redacted portions of the submitted information, including an individual's date of birth and telephone number, but also including other information. Pursuant to section 552.301 of the Government Code, a governmental body that seeks to withhold requested information must submit to this office a copy of the information, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the copy, unless the governmental body has received a previous determination for the information at issue. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a), (e)(1)(D). The department does not assert, nor does our review of the records indicate, it has been authorized to withhold any of the redacted information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). Therefore, information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether the information comes within the scope of an exception to disclosure. In this instance, we can discern the nature of the date of birth and

telephone number; thus, being deprived of this information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. However, we are unable to discern the nature of the remaining redacted information. Consequently, the department has failed to comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code as to this information, and this information is presumed public under section 552.302 of the Government Code. Accordingly, the department must release the remaining redacted information pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code. We note in the future, the department should refrain from redacting any information it is not authorized to withhold in seeking an open records ruling.

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 department must withhold the motor vehicle record information it marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Further, 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).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." 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. 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.). We note an individual's telephone number is generally not private information under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 554 at 3 (1990) (disclosure of person's name, address, or telephone number not invasion of privacy). Upon review, we agree the department must withhold the public citizen's date of birth it marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the department has not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the department must withhold the motor vehicle record information it marked and the entireties of the submitted video recordings under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The department must withhold the public citizen's date of birth it

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.<sup>1</sup>

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# 851215

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.