



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 3, 2020

Mr. Christopher Duncan  
Attorney for City of Freeport  
Duncan Law Firm  
104 West Myrtle, Suite 218  
Angleton, Texas 77515

OR2020-27620

Dear Mr. Duncan:

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# 852054.

The City of Freeport (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for the investigation file pertaining to a specified fatal vehicle accident involving the requestor's clients. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.1085 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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.<sup>1</sup> 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).

We note the remaining information contains a CR-3 accident report that is subject to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. Section 550.065 applies only to a written report of an accident required under section 550.061, 550.062, or 601.004. *See* Transp. Code § 550.065(a)(1). Chapter 550 requires the creation of a written report when the accident resulted in injury to or the death of a person or damage to the property of any person to the apparent extent of \$1,000 or more. *Id.* §§ 550.061 (operator’s accident report), .062 (officer’s accident report). An accident report is privileged and for the confidential use of the Texas Department of Transportation or a local governmental agency of Texas that has use for the information for accident prevention purposes. *Id.* § 550.065(b). However, a governmental entity shall release an accident report in accordance with subsections (c) and (c-1). *Id.* § 550.065(c), (c-1). Section 550.065(c) provides a governmental entity shall release an accident report to a person or entity listed under this subsection. *Id.* § 550.065(c).

In this instance, the requestor is a person listed under section 550.065(c). Accordingly, the city must release the accident report in its entirety to this requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c) of the Transportation Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.”<sup>2</sup> 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. This office has also found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (personal financial information includes choice of particular insurance carrier). 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.).

---

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

<sup>2</sup> 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 No. 481, 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

However, the requestor is a legal representative of the one of the involved individuals whose privacy interest is at issue. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (“person’s authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person’s privacy interests”); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning herself). Thus, the requestor has a right of access to information pertaining to his client that would otherwise be confidential under common-law privacy. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information from this requestor under section 552.101 on the basis of common-law privacy. Additionally, because “the right of privacy is purely personal[,]” that right “terminates upon the death of the person whose privacy is invaded[.]” *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. Civ. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref’d n.r.e.); *see also Justice v. Belo Broad. Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 147 (N.D. Tex. 1979) (“action for invasion of privacy can be maintained only by a living individual whose privacy is invaded” (quoting RESTATEMENT (SECOND) OF TORTS § 6521)); Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) (“the right of privacy lapses upon death”), H-917 (1976) (“We are . . . of the opinion that the Texas courts would follow the almost uniform rule of other jurisdictions that the right of privacy lapses upon death.”); Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981) (“the right of privacy is personal and lapses upon death”). Accordingly, information pertaining to a deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law grounds. Thus, with the exception of the date of birth of the requestor’s client and the deceased individual, the city must withhold all public citizens’ dates of birth and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.1085 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part, the following:

(c) A sensitive crime scene image in the custody of a governmental body is confidential and excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 and a governmental body may not permit a person to view or copy the image except as provided by this section. This section applies to any sensitive crime scene image regardless of the date that the image was taken or recorded.

Gov’t Code § 552.1085(c). For purposes of section 552.1085, “sensitive crime scene image” means “a photograph or video recording taken at a crime scene, contained in or part of a closed criminal case, that depicts a deceased person in a state of dismemberment, decapitation, or similar mutilation or that depicts the deceased person’s genitalia.” *See id.* § 552.1085(a)(6). Upon review, we find none of the submitted photographs consist of sensitive crime scene images for the purposes of section 552.1085. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted photographs under section 552.1085(c) of the Government Code.

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 release the accident report in its entirety to this requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c) of the Transportation Code. With the exception of the date of birth of the requestor’s client and the deceased individual, the department must withhold all public

citizens' dates of birth and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must release the remaining information.<sup>3</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,

Pearlie Gault  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

PG/rm

Ref: ID# 852054

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>3</sup> We note the information being released contains information to which the requestor has a right of access under section 552.023 of the Government Code. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a), (b) ORD 481 at 4. Accordingly, if the city receives another request for this same information from a different requestor, it must again seek a ruling from this office.