



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 1, 2022

Mr. James Kopp
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2022-09685

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# 940037 (COSA File No. W425106).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for specified incident reports. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.152 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. *See* 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 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

¹ 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.

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

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 730.004 of the Transportation Code, which provides “an agency may not disclose personal information about any person obtained by the agency in connection with a motor vehicle record.” Transp. Code § 730.004. “Personal information” includes a person’s driver identification number, name, address, but not the zip code, and telephone number. *Id.* § 730.003(6). The Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) is an “agency” for purposes of chapter 730. *See id.* § 730.003(1) (“agency” is state agency that compiles or maintains motor vehicle records). You state some of the remaining information was obtained by the city from DPS. *See id.* § 730.007(a)(2)(A)(I) (personal information may be disclosed to government agency in carrying out its functions). An authorized recipient of personal information may not re-disclose the personal information, and to do so is a misdemeanor offense. *Id.* § 730.013(a), (d). Accordingly, we find the city must withhold the driver identification numbers and names, addresses, and telephone numbers, but not the zip codes, of the individuals at issue in the portions of the information it received from DPS under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with sections 730.004 and 730.013 of the Transportation Code. However, the remaining information at issue is not confidential under section 730.004 or section 730.013, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 on either of those grounds.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. *See Gov’t Code* § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the information at issue relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(2), .301(e)(1)(A). You assert the information you indicated relates to criminal investigations that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. Based upon your representation, we conclude section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the information at issue.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure “basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.” *Id.* § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). *See Open Records Decision No. 127* (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Accordingly, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.108(a)(2) 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 the *Industrial Foundation* decision. *Id.* at 683. This office 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, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 545 (1990) (common-law privacy protects mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 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). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). 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 remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the public citizens' dates of birth and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated how any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law informer's privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority. *See* Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer's privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." Open Records Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton Rev. Ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). However, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make a report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer's privilege. The privilege excepts the informer's statement only

to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990). We note the informer's privilege does not apply where the informant's identity is known to the individual who is the subject of the complaint. *See* ORD 208 at 1-2.

You state portions of the remaining information identify a complainant who reported violations of law to the city's police department. Based upon the city's representations and our review, we conclude the city has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to some of the information at issue, which we marked. Therefore, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. However, you have failed to demonstrate the remainder of the information at issue consists of the identifying information of an individual who made a report of a criminal violation to the city's police department for purposes of the informer's privilege. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release.² *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 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." *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

You seek to withhold the identifying information of undercover officers under section 552.152 of the Government Code. Section 552.152 provides,

Information in the custody of a governmental body that relates to an employee or officer of the governmental body is excepted from [required public disclosure] if, under the specific circumstances pertaining to the employee or officer, disclosure of the information would subject the employee or officer to a substantial threat of physical harm.

Gov't Code § 552.152. You represent the release of the undercover officers' identities in the remaining information would subject the officers at issue to a substantial threat of physical harm. Upon review, we find you have demonstrated release of some of the information at issue would subject the officers to a substantial threat of physical harm. Therefore, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city must

² The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

withhold the information you marked under section 552.152 of the Government Code. However, we find you have not established section 552.152 of the Government Code is applicable to the remaining information at issue, and the city may not withhold it on that ground.

In summary, the city must withhold the submitted accident reports 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 reports pursuant to section 550.065(c-1) of the Transportation Code. The city must withhold the driver identification numbers and names, addresses, and telephone numbers, but not the zip codes, of the individuals at issue in the portions of the information it received from DPS under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with sections 730.004 and 730.013 of the Transportation Code. With the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the information you indicated under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the public citizens' dates of birth and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. With the exception of the information we marked for release, the city must withhold the information you marked under section 552.152 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,

Deborah Southerland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DS/mo

³ The information being released contains social security numbers. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. See Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

Mr. James Kopp - Page 6

Ref: ID# 940037

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)