



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 9, 2020

Mr. Daniel Sylvia
Counsel for the City of Dayton
Fielder & Davis
1517 Trinity Street
Liberty, Texas 77575-4628

OR2020-28135

Dear Mr. Sylvia:

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# 852727.

The City of Dayton (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 sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes the breath test results of an individual's blood alcohol content. Section 724.018 of the Transportation Code provides that "[o]n request of the person who has given a specimen at the request of a peace officer, full information concerning the analysis of the specimen shall be made available to the person or the person's attorney." Transp. Code § 724.018. Here, the requestor is the individual who submitted the specimen. Although you claim the information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code, a specific right of access provision prevails over the Act's general exceptions to disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision No. 451 at 4 (1986) (specific statutory right of access provisions overcome general exceptions to disclosure under statutory predecessor to Act). You also assert section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy for portions of the intoxilyzer results. However, a statutory right of access generally prevails over the common law. *See CenterPoint Energy Houston Elec. LLC v. Harris County Toll Road Auth.*, 436 F.3d 541, 544 (5th Cir. 2006) (common law controls only where there is no conflicting or controlling statutory law); *see also* ORD 451 at 4. Therefore, the city must release the submitted intoxilyzer results to this requestor pursuant to section 724.018 of the Transportation Code.

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.” Gov’t Code § 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 relates to an active criminal investigation. Generally, the release of information pertaining to an open case is presumed to interfere with the criminal investigation. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases). We note, however, the remaining information at issue is a DIC-24 Statutory Warning and a DIC-25 Notice of Suspension. The DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms have previously been provided to the arrestee. Because copies of these documents have previously been released to the arrestee, we find the city has not demonstrated release of these documents will interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). Therefore, the city may not withhold the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms under section 552.108(a)(1).

You also claim section 552.103 of the Government Code for the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms. Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person’s office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Id. § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, *writ ref’d n.r.e.*); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

We note the purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information related to litigation through

the discovery process. *See* ORD 551 at 4 5. Thus, any information obtained from or provided to all other parties in the anticipated or pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. The submitted DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms were provided to the arrestee; thus, the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms were inevitably seen by the opposing party to the litigation. Therefore, the city may not withhold the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms under section 552.103.

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. Section 552.101 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 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.). You claim section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy for the date of birth you marked in the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms. The requestor has a right of access to her own date of birth pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a) (person or person’s authorized representation 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 individuals request information concerning themselves). Thus, the city may not withhold the date of birth you marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. As no other exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the submitted information must be released.

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,

Chase D. Young
Attorney
Open Records Division

CDY/eb

Mr. Daniel Sylvia - Page 4

Ref: ID# 852727

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)