



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 30, 2022

Mr. James Tidwell
Counsel for the City of Howe
Wolfe, Tidwell & McCoy, L.L.P.
320 North Travis Street, Suite 205
Sherman, Texas 75090

OR2022-18988

Dear Mr. Tidwell:

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# 955284.

The Howe Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident involving the requestor's client. You state you released some information. You claim some of the submitted information was not properly requested pursuant to section 1701.661 of the Occupations Code. You also claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.108, and 552.130 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:

(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.¹ 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 the remaining information includes a video recording subject to article 2.1396 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which provides:

A person stopped or arrested on suspicion of an offense under Section 49.04, 49.045, 49.07, or 49.08, Penal Code, is entitled to receive from a law enforcement agency employing the peace officer who made the stop or arrest a copy of any video made by or at the direction of the officer that contains footage of:

- (1) the stop;
- (2) the arrest;
- (3) the conduct of the person stopped during any interaction with the officer, including during the administration of a field sobriety test; or
- (4) a procedure in which a specimen of the person’s breath or blood is taken.

Crim. Proc. Code art. 2.1396. The information at issue consists of a video recording made by or at the direction of officers employed by the department that contains footage of the requestor’s client being stopped or arrested on suspicion of an offense under section 49.04 of the Penal Code. Penal Code § 49.04 (person commits offense if person is intoxicated while operating motor vehicle in public place). Therefore, the requestor is entitled to receive a copy of portions of this video recording pursuant to article 2.1396. Although the department asserts sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code to withhold this information, a statutory right of access prevails over the Act’s general exceptions to public disclosure. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 613 at 4 (1993) (exceptions in Act cannot impinge on statutory right of access to information), 451 (1986) (specific statutory

¹ As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

right of access provisions overcome general exception to disclosure under the Act). We note sections 552.103 and 552.108 are general exceptions under the Act. Accordingly, the requestor's statutory right of access under article 2.1396 prevails. Additionally, although you assert the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, a statutory right of access prevails over the common-law. *Collins v. Tex Mall, L.P.*, 297 S.W. 3d 409, 415 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2009, no pet.) (statutory provision controls and preempts common law only when statute directly conflicts with common law principle); *CenterPoint Energy Houston Elec. LLC v. Harris County Toll Rd. Auth.*, 436 F.3d 541, 544 (5th Cir. 2006) (common law controls only where there is no conflicting or controlling statutory law). Accordingly, the department may not withhold any portion of the video recording at issue that depicts the stop, the arrest, the conduct of the requestor's client, or a procedure in which a specimen of the requestor's client's blood or breath is taken under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy or sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code.

You also assert section 552.130 of the Government Code for the video recording at issue. Section 552.130 provides 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 is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a). As previously noted, a statutory right of access generally prevails over the Act's general exceptions to disclosure. *See* ORDs 613 at 4, 451. However, because section 552.130 has its own access provisions, we find section 552.130 is not a general exception under the Act. Therefore, we must address the conflict between the confidentiality provided under section 552.130 and the right of access provided under article 2.1396 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Where information falls within both a general and a specific provision of law, the specific provision prevails over the general, unless the general provision was enacted later and there is clear evidence that the legislature intended the general provision to prevail. *See Horizon/CMS Healthcare Corp. v. Auld*, 34 S.W.3d 887, 901 (Tex. 2000) ("more specific statute controls over the more general"); *Cuellar v. State*, 521 S.W.2d 211 (Tex. Crim. App. 1975) (under well-established rule of statutory construction, specific statutory provisions prevail over general ones). In this instance, section 552.130 generally excepts motor vehicle record information maintained in any context, while article 2.1396 specifically provides access to certain video footage pertaining to certain intoxication offense arrests. Thus, we find the access to the video recordings at issue provided under article 2.1396 is more specific than the general confidentiality provided under section 552.130. Additionally, we note article 2.1396 is the later enacted statute. *See* Gov't Code § 311.025(a) (if statutes enacted at different sessions of legislature are irreconcilable, statute latest in enactment prevails). Therefore, we conclude the requestor's access to the video recording under article 2.1396 prevails over the confidentiality of section 552.130. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any portion of the video recording at issue under section 552.130, and the department must release these portions of the video recording at issue to this requestor pursuant to article 2.1396 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. However, we will address your arguments against disclosure of the portions of the video recording that is not subject to article 2.1396.

We note the remaining information includes a Toxicology Request Submission Form, a Toxicology Laboratory Report, and results of an analysis of a blood specimen. Section 724.018 of the Transportation Code provides that, on the request of the person who has given a specimen at the request of a peace officer, full information concerning the analysis of the specimen must be made available to that person or the person's attorney. Transp. Code § 724.018. The requestor's client is the person who provided the specimen at the request of a peace officer. Although you claim the information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code, a specific right of access provision prevails over the Act's general exceptions to disclosure. *See* ORD 451 at 4. Therefore, the department must release the information we marked pursuant to section 724.018 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 department states the remaining information pertains to a presently ongoing criminal investigation. We note, however, that the information at issue includes a DIC-24 statutory warning and a DIC-25 notice of suspension. The department provided copies of these forms to the arrestee. You have not explained how releasing this information, which has already been seen by the arrestee, would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). Accordingly, the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms may not be withheld under section 552.108. However, based upon your representations, we conclude that 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, we find section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the remaining information at issue.

However, 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). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-187; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). We note basic information includes the identity of the complainant, but does not include dates of birth or motor vehicle record information encompassed by section 552.130 of the Government Code. *See* ORD 127 at 3-4. Accordingly, with the exception of basic information and the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms, which must generally be released, the department may withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.108(a)(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. This section 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 seek to withhold portions of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege. You state the complainant reported possible violations of law to the department, which is authorized to enforce the laws at issue. Based on your representations, we agree the department may withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege.

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. The department must release any portion of the remaining video recording that depicts the stop, the arrest, the conduct of the requestor’s client, or a procedure in which a specimen of the blood or breath of the requestor is taken pursuant to article 2.1396 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The department must release the information we marked pursuant to section 724.018 of the Transportation Code. With the exception of basic information and the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms, which must generally be released, the department may withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. In releasing basic information, the department may withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege.²

² We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. Thus, if the department receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the department must again seek a decision from this office.

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,

Pearlie Gault
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PG/jxd

Ref: ID# 955284

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)