



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 25, 2022

Mr. James Kopp  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of San Antonio  
P.O. Box 839966  
San Antonio, Texas 78207

OR2022-02056

Dear Mr. Kopp:

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# 926416 (COSA File No. W411195-102621).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for photographs and video recordings related to a particular case. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.<sup>1</sup>

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. This section encompasses information made confidential by other statutes. We note the submitted information contains a recording from a city police officer's body worn cameras. Section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code states the information a requestor must provide when seeking a body worn camera recording. *See* Occ. Code § 1701.661(a). We note the requestor provides the requisite information for the body worn camera recording at issue. However, section 1701.661(f) provides, in relevant part:

---

<sup>1</sup> We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

A law enforcement agency may not release any portion of a recording made in a private space . . . 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.

*Id.* § 1701.661(f). Upon review, we conclude portions of the body worn camera recording at issue were made in a private space. *See id.* § 1701.651(3) (defining “private space” for purposes of section 1701.661(f)). You state the city has not received written authorization for release from all of the subjects of the recording made in the private space or their authorized representatives. *See id.* § 1701.661(f). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.661(f) of the Occupations Code.<sup>2</sup> However, we find the remainder of the body worn camera recording at issue was not made in a private space for the purposes of section 1701.661(f). Furthermore, we note the remaining information does not consist of body worn camera recordings subject to section 1701.661 of the Occupations Code. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.661(f) of the Government Code.

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). However, 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 Broadcasting 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”). Accordingly, information pertaining to a deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law privacy grounds. Upon review, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

---

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

Section 552.130 of the Government Code exempts 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.<sup>3</sup> See Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold all visible license plates and registration stickers within the remaining information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.661(f) of the Occupations Code. The city must withhold all visible license plates and registration stickers within the remaining information under section 552.130 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,

Erin Groff  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

EMG/jxd

Ref: ID# 926416

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>3</sup> 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, 480 (1987), 470 (1987).