



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 10, 2022

Mr. Kevin Bailey
Assistant City Attorney
City of Midland
P.O. Box 1152
Midland, Texas 79701

OR2022-00825

Dear Mr. Bailey:

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# 924110 (Reference Nos. M035118-100621, M035285-102021, M035286-102021, and M035451-110421).

The City of Midland (the "city") received four requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to a specified accident. You state the city has released some information to the requestor with redactions. You claim some of the submitted information was not properly requested pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. You also claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, as you acknowledge, the submitted information includes information 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) of the Occupations Code provides the following:

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) for most of the submitted recordings, which we indicated. As the recordings we indicated 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.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). We note the requestor in her fourth request includes the information required by section 1701.661(a) with respect to the remaining body worn camera recordings. *Id.* § 1701.661(a). Accordingly, we find the requestor properly requested the remaining body worn camera recordings at issue and we will address the city’s arguments against their disclosure.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, such as section 1701.661(f) of the Occupations Code, which provides:

A law enforcement agency may not release any portion of a recording made in a private space, or of a recording involving the investigation of conduct that constitutes a misdemeanor punishable by fine only and does not result in arrest, without written authorization from the person who is the subject of that portion of the recording or, if the person is deceased, from the person’s authorized representative.

Occ. Code § 1701.661(f). You assert the body worn camera recordings at issue were made in a private space. *See id.* § 1701.651(3) (defining “private space” for purposes of section 1701.661(f)). Upon review, however, we find the body worn camera recordings at issue were not made in a private space. *See id.* Therefore, the city may not withhold the remaining body worn camera recordings at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.661(f) of the Occupations Code.

¹ As we are able to make this determination, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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). The court of appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code. 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.). We note the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death and the common-law right to privacy does not encompass information that relates only to a deceased individual. *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 § 652I (1977))); 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”). Thus, information pertaining to a deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law privacy grounds. Accordingly, the city must withhold all living public citizens' dates of birth within the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find none of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the remaining information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground.

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. We note, because section 552.130 protects privacy interests, the requestor has a right of access to her client's motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. See *id.* § 552.023(b) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); ORD 481 at 4 (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Further, as noted above, the right of privacy lapses at death. Thus, motor

²The 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).

vehicle record information that pertains solely to deceased individuals may not be withheld under section 552.130. *See Moore*, 589 S.W.2d at 491; *see also* Attorney General Opinions JM-229; H-917; ORD 272. Accordingly, with the exception of the information pertaining to the requestor's client or solely to a deceased individual, the city must withhold the license plate number, issuing state for the license plate, vehicle identification number, driver's license numbers, and issuing state for the driver's licenses in the submitted documents and all audible and visible license plates, driver's license information, and motor vehicle registration information in the remaining video and audio files under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, as the recordings we indicated 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. With the exception of the information pertaining to the requestor's client or solely to a deceased individual, the city must withhold the license plate number, issuing state for the license plate, vehicle identification number, driver's license numbers, and issuing state for the driver's licenses in the submitted documents and all audible and visible license plates, driver's license information, and motor vehicle registration information in the remaining video and audio files under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.³

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,

James M. Graham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JMG/jm

³ We note the requestor has a right of access to her client's motor vehicle record information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023; *see also* ORD 481 at 4. We also note section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e).

Mr. Kevin Bailey - Page 5

Ref: ID# 924110

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)