



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 13, 2022

Ms. Lindsey M. Hale  
Counsel for the City of River Oaks  
Taylor, Olson, Adkins, Sralla & Elam, L.L.P.  
6000 Western Place, Suite 200  
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2022-16962

Dear Ms. Hale:

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# 953446.

The City of River Oaks Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received five requests from five different requestors for information pertaining to a named individual, including information pertaining to a specified incident. You state you will release some information to the requestors. You state the department is withholding 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 claim some information is not properly requested pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. You also claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes police officers' body worn camera recordings. Body 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:

---

<sup>1</sup> 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* Gov't Code § 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 to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* ORD 684.

(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 requestors do 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).

Next, we note some of the submitted information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant request for information because it does not pertain to the named individual. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the department is not required to release such information in response to this request.

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.107. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly,

---

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

the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, *id.*, meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *See Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

Upon review, you have failed to establish how the responsive information constitutes privileged attorney-client communications for the purposes of section 552.107(1). Accordingly, the department may not withhold any portion of the responsive information under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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 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. A compilation of an individual’s criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. U.S. Dep’t of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual’s privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one’s criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen’s criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. We note active warrant information or other information relating to an individual’s current involvement in the criminal justice system does not constitute criminal history information for the purposes of section 552.101. *See* Gov’t Code § 411.081(b) (police department allowed to disclose information pertaining to person’s current involvement in the criminal justice system).

Two of the present requests, in part, seek all reports pertaining to a named individual. These portions of these requests require the department to compile unspecified law enforcement records concerning the named individual. We find these requests for unspecified law enforcement records implicate the named individual’s right to privacy. Therefore, to the extent the department maintains unspecified law enforcement records listing the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the department must withhold such information from these requestors, who we have indicated, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, information that

refers to an individual solely as a victim, witness, or involved person is not part of a compilation of the individual's criminal history and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis. We note you have submitted information that does not list the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant. We further note one of these requestors seeks information pertaining to a specified incident. This information is not part of a compilation of an individual's criminal history, and the department may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy on that basis. Accordingly, we will address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

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[.]” *Id.* § 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 department states portions of the remaining information, which you marked, pertain to an active criminal investigation or prosecution. Based on this representation, we conclude the release of the 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 information you marked.

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; Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Accordingly, with the exception of the basic information, which must be released, the department may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

As previously noted, section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. 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. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). We note a requestor has a right of access to their own date of birth pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (“person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests”); Open

---

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

Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Thus, the department must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth to which the requestor does not have a right of access under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the submitted body worn camera recordings were not properly requested pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code and they need not be released. To the extent the department maintains unspecified law enforcement records listing the named individual as a suspect, arrestee, or criminal defendant, the department must withhold such information from the two requestors we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. With the exception of the basic information, which must be released, the department may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The department must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth to which the requestor does not have a right of access under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining responsive information must be released.

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,

Colin Henry  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

CEH/jxd

Ref: ID# 953446

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 5 Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)