



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 3, 2020

Mr. M. Shelby Pearcy
Counsel for the City of Red Oak
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, L.L.P.
500 North Akard Street, Suite 1800
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2020-27498

Dear Mr. Pearcy:

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# 852039 (Ref. No. TM 117639).

The City of Red Oak (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is 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 information at issue was not properly requested pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information and the city need not release the information we indicated.¹ *See generally King v. Paxton*, 576 S.W.3d 881 (Tex. App.—Austin 2019, pet. denied). 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.” Occ. Code § 1701.661(b). Upon review, we note the remaining information does not consist of body worn camera recordings. Therefore, the remaining information is not subject to section 1701.661 of the Occupations Code, and the city may not withhold any portion of it on that basis.

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. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. The court of appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *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.). Accordingly, the city must withhold the date of birth we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure 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.² *See* Gov’t Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold all visible license plates and registration stickers within the remaining video recording and the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, as the information at issue was not properly requested pursuant to section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information and the city need not release the information we indicated. The city must: (1) withhold the date of birth we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (2) withhold all visible license plates and registration stickers within the remaining video recording and the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code; and (3) release the remaining information.

¹ As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your argument against disclosure of this information.

² The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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/jm

Ref: ID# 852039

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)