



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 30, 2020

Mr. Mark G. Mann  
Senior Assistant City Attorney  
City of Garland  
P.O. Box 469002  
Garland, Texas 75046-9002

OR2020-27328

Dear Mr. Mann:

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# 851699 (Ref. No. GCA20-0690).

The City of Garland (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You state you will redact certain dates of birth pursuant to Open Records Letter No. 2017-22182 (2017).<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.108 and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes a city police officer's 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;

---

<sup>1</sup> Open Records Letter No. 2017-22182 authorizes the city to withhold the dates of birth of public citizens under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without requesting a decision from this office.

(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.<sup>2</sup> 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 portions of the remaining information are subject to article 2.1396 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which provides,

A person stopped or arrested on suspicion of an offense under Section 49.04, 49.045, 49.07, or 49.08, Penal Code, is entitled to receive from a law enforcement agency employing the peace officer who made the stop or arrest a copy of any video made by or at the direction of the officer that contains footage of:

(1) the stop;

(2) the arrest;

(3) the conduct of the person stopped during any interaction with the officer, including during the administration of a field sobriety test;  
or

(4) a procedure in which a specimen of the person’s breath or blood is taken.

Crim Proc. Code art 2.1396. The remaining information includes video recordings made by or at the direction of officers employed by the department that contain footage of the requestor’s client being stopped or arrested on suspicion of an offense under section 49.07 of the Penal Code. *See* Penal Code § 49.07 (person commits offense if person causes serious bodily injury to another while operating a motor vehicle while intoxicated). Thus, the requestor is entitled to receive these portions of the video recordings pursuant to article 2.1396 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Although you seek to withhold the information at issue under sections 552.108 and 552.130 of the Government Code, a statutory right of access prevails over the Act’s general exceptions to public disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 613 at 4 (1993) (exceptions in Act cannot impinge on statutory right of access

---

<sup>2</sup> As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

to information), 451 (1986) (specific statutory right of access provisions overcome general exception to disclosure under the Act). Because section 552.108 of the Government Code is a general exception under the Act, the requestor's statutory right of access under article 2.1396 prevails. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any portion of the responsive video recordings that depicts the stop, the arrest, the conduct of the requestor, or a procedure in which a specimen of the blood or breath of the requestor is taken under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or 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. Gov't Code § 552.130(a). However, because section 552.130 has its own access provisions, we conclude section 552.130 is not a general exception under the Act. Thus, we must address the conflict between the confidentiality provided under section 552.130 of the Government Code and the right of access provided under article 2.1396 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Where information falls within both a general and a specific provision of law, the specific provision prevails over the general. *See id.* § 311.026(b); *Horizon/CMS Healthcare Corp. v. Auld*, 34 S.W.3d 887, 901 (Tex. 2000) (“more specific statute controls over the more general”); *Cuellar v. State*, 521 S.W.2d 211 (Tex. Crim. App. 1975) (under well-established rule of statutory construction, specific statutory provisions prevail over general ones). In this instance, section 552.130 generally excepts motor vehicle record information maintained in any context, while article 2.1396 specifically provides access to certain video footage pertaining to certain intoxication offense arrests. Thus, we conclude the access under article 2.1396 is more specific than the general confidentiality provided under section 552.130. Additionally, we note article 2.1396 is the later enacted statute. *See* Gov't Code § 311.025(a) (if statutes enacted at different sessions of legislature are irreconcilable, statute latest in enactment prevails). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining video recordings that are subject to article 2.1396 under section 552.130. Therefore, the city must release the remaining portions of the video recordings that depict the stop, the arrest, or the conduct of the requestor pursuant to article 2.1396 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. However, we will address your remaining arguments against disclosure of any remaining portions of the video recordings at issue.

Section 552.108(a) 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.” *Id.* § 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 remaining information you have marked relates to an ongoing investigation, and release of that information would interfere with the investigation and prosecution of the case. Based upon this representation, 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. Accordingly, the city may withhold the remaining information you have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

In summary, as the requestor did not properly request the body worn camera recordings 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 portions of the remaining video recordings that depict the stop, the arrest, or the conduct of the requestor pursuant to article 2.1396 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The city may withhold the remaining information you have marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city 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,

Meredith L. Coffman  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MLC/be

Ref: ID# 851699

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>3</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.