



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 13, 2022

Ms. Amy L. Sims
Deputy City Attorney
City of Lubbock
P.O. Box 2000
Lubbock, Texas 79457

OR2022-16880

Dear Ms. Sims:

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# 953107 (ORR# P000656-032122).

The City of Lubbock (the "city") received a request for all information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, 552.130, 552.136, and 552.147 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is 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(a) provides:

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

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.

(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 information we indicated was not properly requested pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released.² *See generally King v. Paxton*, 576 S.W.3d 881 (Tex. App.— Austin 2019, pet. denied). 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.” Occ. Code § 1701.661(b).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts 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 made confidential by federal law. The submitted information contains information that was reported to the National Trace Center of the Department of Justice Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives (the “ATF”). Public Law number 112-55 states, in pertinent part, as follows:

[D]uring the current fiscal year and in each fiscal year thereafter, no funds appropriated under [the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2012] or any other [a]ct may be used to disclose part or all of the contents of the Firearms Trace System database maintained by the National Trace Center of the [ATF] or any information required to be kept by licensees pursuant to section 923(g) of title 18, United States Code, or required to be reported pursuant to paragraphs (3) and (7) of such section, except to: (1) a Federal, State, local, or trial law enforcement agency, or a Federal, State, or local Prosecution . . . unless such disclosure of such data to a[n] . . . entit[y] described in (1) . . . of this provision would compromise the identity of any undercover law enforcement officer or confidential informant, or interfere with any case under investigation; and no person or entity described in (1) . . . shall knowingly and publicly disclose such data; and all such data shall be immune from legal process, shall not be subject to subpoena or other discovery, shall be inadmissible in evidence, and shall not be used, relied on, or disclosed in any manner, nor shall testimony or other evidence be permitted based on the data, in a civil action in any State[.]

Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2021, Pub. L. No. 112-55, 125 Stat. 552, 609-10 (2011). The submitted information contains a Firearms Trace Summary, which consists of content from the Firearms Trace System database maintained by the National Trace Center. Upon review, we find the submitted Firearms Trace Summary is confidential under Public Law number 112-55. *See Miller v. U.S. Dep’t of Justice*, 562 F.Supp. 2d 82, 111 (D.D.C. 2008) (holding Firearms Trace Report properly withheld under

² As we are able to make this determination, we need not address the submitted arguments against disclosure of this information.

Freedom of Information Act exemption 3, which covers records that are exempt from disclosure by statute). Accordingly, the city must withhold the submitted Firearms Trace Summary, which we marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Public Law number 112-55.³

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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 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 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 560.003 of the Government Code, which provides, “[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under [the Act].” Gov’t Code § 560.003; *see id.* § 560.001(1) (“biometric identifier” means retina or iris scan, fingerprint, voiceprint, or record of hand or face geometry). There is no indication the requestor has a right of access to the biometric identifiers under section 560.002. *See id.* § 560.002(1)(A) (governmental body may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose individual’s biometric identifier to another person unless the individual consents to disclosure). Accordingly, the city must withhold the submitted fingerprints under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information made confidential by statute, such as the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant part:

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

(a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(a)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. This office has concluded the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982).* Upon review, we find the information we marked constitutes a record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.⁴

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently, and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. *Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987).* The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the information we indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the constitutional right to privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government 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

⁴ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin 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. 600* (1992), *545* (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). However, information concerning financial transactions between an employee and a public employer is generally of legitimate public interest. ORD 545.

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

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts 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. *See Gov't Code § 552.130*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

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.” *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Upon review, we find you have not explained how any of the remaining information consists of a credit card, debit card, or charge card number, or is an access device number used to obtain money, goods, services, or any item of value, or used to initiate the transfer of funds. *See id.* §§ 552.136(a), .301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies). Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.136 of the Government Code to the remaining information and the city may not withhold it on this ground.

Section 552.147 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the social security number of a living person. *Id.* § 552.147. Upon review, we agree the city may withhold the social security numbers within the remaining information under section 552.147 of the Government Code.

In summary, as the information we indicated was 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 city must withhold the submitted Firearms Trace Summary, which we marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Public Law number 112-55. 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. The city must withhold the submitted fingerprints under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The city must withhold the information we indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the constitutional right to privacy. The city must withhold the dates of birth of all public citizens and the information we marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the social security numbers within the remaining information under section 552.147 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,

Joseph Hoggatt
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JWH/jxd

Ref: ID# 953107

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)