



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 7, 2020

Ms. Leslie A. Whitten  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of College Station  
P.O. Box 9960  
College Station, Texas 77842

OR2020-30356

Dear Ms. Whitten:

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# 856837 (File No. A20-001575).

The City of College Station (the "city") received two requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to a specified incident involving the requestor. You state you released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes a police officer's body worn camera recording. 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 recording at issue was 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 requestors from making a future request for the same recorded information.” *Id.* § 1701.661(b).

Next, we note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(17) information that is also contained in a public court record[.]

Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(17). The remaining information includes court-filed documents that are subject to section 552.022(a)(17). This information must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* The city seeks to withhold the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, section 552.108 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to Gov’t Code § 552.108 subject to waiver).* Therefore, the city may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022, which we marked, under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

We note the remaining information includes a Toxicology Request Submission Form, a Toxicology Laboratory Report, and results of an analysis of a blood specimen. Section 724.018 of the Transportation Code provides that, on the request of the person who has given a specimen at the request of a peace officer, full information concerning the analysis of the specimen must be made available to that person or the person’s attorney. Transp. Code § 724.018. Here, the requestor is the person who gave the specimen at the request of a peace officer. The city seeks to withhold this information under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, we note a statutory right of access generally prevails over the exceptions to public disclosure under the Act. *See, e.g., Open Records Decision Nos. 613 at 4 (1993) (exceptions in Act cannot impinge on statutory right of access to information), 451 (1986) (specific statutory right of access provisions overcome general exception to disclosure under the Act).* Thus, the city must release the information we marked to this requestor pursuant to section 724.018 of the Transportation Code.

---

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

Section 552.108(a)(1) 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 . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). 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). The city states the remaining information pertains to a presently pending criminal investigation. We note, however, that the information at issue includes a DIC-24 statutory warning and a DIC-25 notice of suspension. The city provided copies of these forms to the arrestee. You have not explained how releasing this information, which has already been seen by the arrestee, would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). Accordingly, the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms may not be withheld under section 552.108. However, based upon your representations, we conclude that the release of the remaining 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, we find section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the remaining information at issue.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure “basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.” Gov’t Code § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-187; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Accordingly, with the exception of basic information and the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms, which must be released, the city may withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the submitted body worn camera recording was not properly requested pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code and it need not be released. The city must release the court-filed documents we have marked pursuant to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. The city must release the information we marked to this requestor pursuant to section 724.018 of the Transportation Code. With the exception of the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms and basic information, which must be also released, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>2</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.

---

<sup>2</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) (individual has special right of access to information that relates to herself and is protected by laws intended to protect his privacy interests, and governmental body may not deny access on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning herself). Accordingly, if the city receives another request for this same information from a different requestor, it must again seek a ruling from this office.

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/jm

Ref: ID# 856837

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)