



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 10, 2021

Ms. Erin J. Onyon  
Director of Public Records & Transparency Compliance  
City of Mansfield  
1200 East Broad Street  
Mansfield, Texas 76063

OR2020-29110A

Dear Ms. Onyon:

This office issued Open Records Letter No. 2020-29110 (2020) on November 20, 2020. Since that time, we have received new information that affects the facts on which that ruling was based. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.306, .352. Thus, we hereby withdraw the prior ruling. Consequently, this decision serves as the correct ruling and is a substitute for Open Records Letter No. 2020-29110. *See generally id.* § 552.011 (providing that Office of the Attorney General may issue a decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of the Public Information Act (the "Act")). Your request was assigned ID# 869459 (Ref. No. 1168-2020).

The City of Mansfield (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You state the city has released some information to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information was not properly requested pursuant to section 1701.661 of the Occupations Code. You also claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes city 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(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 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 the city need not release it. 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).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts 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, 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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Further, 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.). Upon review, we find some of the information within the remaining video recordings at issue satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. You state the city lacks the technological capability to redact this information from the recordings at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 364 (1983). Based on your representation, we conclude the city must withhold the remaining video recordings in their entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, as the body worn camera recordings at issue were 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 it. The city must withhold the remaining video recordings in their entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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/mo

Ref: ID# 869459

c: Requestor