



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 27, 2022

Mr. Siang L. Sang
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
200 Texas Street, 3rd Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2022-11992

Dear Mr. Sang:

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# 943343 (ORR P03619).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident involving a named individual. The city will release some information. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. The city states it notified a certain individual of the request for information and of the right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See Gov't Code* § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have considered the claimed exceptions 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." *Id.* § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the constitutional right to privacy. Constitutional privacy protects two kinds of interests. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the "zones of privacy," pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships,

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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

and child rearing and education, that have been recognized by the United States Supreme Court. *See Fado v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981); ORD 455 at 3-7. The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985); ORD 455 at 6-7. This aspect of constitutional privacy balances the individual's privacy interest against the public's interest in the information. *See* ORD 455 at 7. Constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for "the most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 8 (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492). We note the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death and therefore may not be asserted solely on behalf of a deceased individual. *See 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.); Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981) ("the right of privacy is personal and lapses upon death"). However, the United States Supreme Court has determined that surviving family members can have a privacy interest in information relating to their deceased relatives. *See Nat'l Archives & Records Admin. v. Favish*, 541 U.S. 157 (2004).

The submitted information relates to a deceased individual. Therefore, it may not be withheld from disclosure based on the deceased individual's privacy interests. However, the city indicates it notified the deceased individual's next of kin of the request for information and of the next of kin's right to assert a privacy interest in the information at issue. As of this date, we have not received correspondence from any of the deceased's family members asserting a privacy interest in the information. Thus, we have no basis for determining a family member has a privacy interest in the information at issue. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy and the holding in *Favish*.

We note the submitted information includes a CR-3 accident report. Section 552.101 of the Government Code 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 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 information subject to section 550.065 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).

Here, 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 from the requestor 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. Although the city asserts section 552.108 to withhold this

information, a statutory right of access under section 550.065(c-1) prevails and the city may not withhold the information under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Thus, the city must release the redacted accident report to the requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c-1) of the Transportation Code.

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 submitted information pertains to a pending criminal prosecution. We note, however, the information at issue includes a DIC-24 Statutory Warning and a DIC-25 Notice of Suspension. The DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms have previously been provided to the arrestee. Because copies of these documents have previously been released to the arrestee, we find the city has not shown release of these documents will interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime, and these documents may not be withheld under section 552.108(a)(1). *See* Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). However, based on the city’s representations and our review, we conclude 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, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the remaining information.

However, we note 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). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Accordingly, with the exception of the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms and the basic information, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.²

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. The Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). Thus, the city must withhold the public citizen’s date of birth in the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

² As we are able to make this determination, we do not address the applicability of section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code to the submitted body worn camera recordings. *See generally* Occ. Code § 1701.661(a), (e).

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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the driver's license number in the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms under section 552.130 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 pursuant to section 550.065(c-1) of the Transportation Code. With the exception of basic information and the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. In releasing the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms, the city must withhold the public citizen's date of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the driver's license number under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

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,

Sarah E. Reese
Attorney
Open Records Division

SER/mo

Ref: ID# 943343

c: Requestor