



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 25, 2022

Mr. David V. Overcash
Counsel for the City of Princeton
Wolfe, Tidwell & McCoy, LLP
2591 Dallas Parkway, Suite 205
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2022-01981

Dear Mr. Overcash:

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# 926525 (Ref. No. W027636-101821).

The City of Princeton (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified accident. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

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 information 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. 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

¹ We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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 not a person listed under section 550.065(c). Thus, the submitted accident report is confidential under section 550.065(b), and the city must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code. However, section 550.065(c-1) requires the city to create a redacted accident report that may be requested by any person. *Id.* § 550.065(c-1). The redacted accident report may not include the information listed in subsection (f)(2). *Id.* Therefore, the requestor has a right of access to the redacted accident report. Thus, the city must release the redacted accident report to the requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c-1).

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit, a motor vehicle title or registration, or a personal identification document issued by an agency of Texas or another state or country is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the submitted video recordings contain information subject to section 552.130. You state the city does not have the technological capability to redact the motor vehicle record information from the recordings. Accordingly, the city must withhold the submitted video recordings in their entireties and the information you and we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.² *See* Open Records Decision No. 364 (1983).

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. This office also has 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. 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). The 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 conclude the information we have marked meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

the information you marked and the additional information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.”³ Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009). Accordingly, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the submitted accident report under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code but must release the redacted accident report to this requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c-1) of the Transportation Code. The city must withhold the submitted video recordings in their entirety and the information you and we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information you marked and the additional information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

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,

Emily Kunst
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EK/mo

³ 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 Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Mr. David V. Overcash - Page 4

Ref: ID# 926525

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)