



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 10, 2022

Ms. Alicia K. Kreh  
Counsel for the Town of Flower Mound  
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam, L.L.P.  
6000 Western Place, Suite 200  
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2022-13394

Dear Ms. Kreh:

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# 946940.

The Flower Mound Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for the personnel file of a named officer and certain information pertaining to a specified case number. You state the department will withhold social security numbers under section 552.147(b) of the Government Code; motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code; and certain information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).<sup>1</sup> You also state the department will release some information to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information was not properly requested pursuant to section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code. You also claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

The submitted information includes police officers' body worn camera recordings. Body

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b). 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 id.* § 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). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination issued by this office authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

worn cameras are 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 provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) 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). As the body worn camera recordings at issue 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.<sup>2</sup> 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.” *Id.* § 1701.661(b).

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 protected by section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in part, as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

- (1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and
- (2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). The remaining information includes information that was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect conducted by the department. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse”

---

<sup>2</sup> As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). Accordingly, we find this information is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. The department does not indicate it has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information and therefore we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, we conclude the department must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.<sup>3</sup> See Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.”<sup>4</sup> Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Thus, under *Texas Comptroller*, section 552.102(a) is applicable to the birth date of an employee of a governmental body in a record maintained by his or her employer in an employment context. Accordingly, the department must withhold the named officer’s date of birth in the remaining information under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.<sup>5</sup>

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, and social security number of a current or honorably retired peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the current or honorably retired peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the current or honorably retired peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code. See Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(2); *id.* § 552.003(1-b) (defining “honorably retired” for purposes of the Act). We note, for purposes of section 552.117, “family member” means a spouse, minor child, or adult child who resides in the person’s home. See *id.* § 552.117(c) (providing that “family member” has meaning assigned by Fin. Code § 31.006(d)). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Therefore, the department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(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 *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. 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. Department of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3 (Tex. App.—Austin

---

<sup>3</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

<sup>4</sup> 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).

<sup>5</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your argument against disclosure of this information.

May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). This office has also 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). However, we note this office has found the public has a legitimate interest in information relating to applicants and employees of governmental bodies and their employment qualifications and job performance, especially where the applicant was seeking a position in law enforcement. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990), 470 at 4 (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 455 at 9 (applicant salary information is of legitimate public interest because it “bears on the applicants’ past employment record and their suitability for the employment position in question”), 444 (1986), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). We note an individual’s name, address, and telephone number are generally not private information under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 554 at 3 (1990) (disclosure of person’s name, address, or telephone number not an invasion of privacy). We note common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals, not those of corporate and other business entities. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); *see also Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989) (corporation has no right to privacy (citing *United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950))), *rev’d on other grounds*, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990). Determinations under common-law privacy must be made on a case-by-case basis. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685 (whether matter is of legitimate interest to public can be considered only in context of each particular case); Open Records Decision No. 373 at 4 (1983).

Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the department must withhold the information we marked and indicated and the dates of birth of public citizens under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing to an individual and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note some of the remaining materials may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, as the body worn camera recordings 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. The department must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. The department must withhold the named officer's date of birth under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. The department must withhold the information we marked and indicated and all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must release the remaining information; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only in accordance with copyright law.

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,

Michelle Garza  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MRG/jm

Ref: ID# 946940

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)