



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 29, 2022

Ms. Karen Horner  
City Attorney  
City of Friendswood  
910 South Friendswood Dr.  
Friendswood, Texas 77546

OR2022-22344

Dear Ms. Horner:

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# 963159 (Ref. No. W014893-050822).

The City of Friendswood (the "city") received a request for all public information requests submitted to the city's police department during a stated time period. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the requestor excludes certain categories of information from the scope of the request. Accordingly, these types of information are not responsive to the request for information. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the city is not required to release that information in response to the request.<sup>1</sup>

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 chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. You raise section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code for some of the submitted information. Section 1701.661 provides, in relevant part, the following:

---

<sup>1</sup> As we are able to make this determination, we need not consider your arguments against disclosure of this information.

(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). Upon review, we find section 1701.661 of the Occupations Code is not applicable to the information at issue, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

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 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).

You argue some of the submitted information is confidential under section 550.065(c). We note, however, the submitted information does not include a written accident report for purposes of section 550.065(a). Thus, we find the city failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 550.065 to the information at issue. Consequently, the city may not withhold any portion of the responsive information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 550.065 of the Transportation 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. This office has also found the public has a legitimate interest in information relating to employees of governmental bodies and their employment qualifications and job performance. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 at 4 (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 405 at 2-3 (1983) (public has

interest in manner in which public employee performs job). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). 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. United States 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). Moreover, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. We note that records relating to routine traffic violations are not considered criminal history information. *Cf. id.* § 411.082(2)(B) (criminal history record information does not include driving record information). However, the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death and the common-law right to privacy does not encompass information that relates only to a deceased individual. *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.); *see also Justice v. Belo Broadcasting Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 147 (N.D. Tex. 1979) (“action for invasion of privacy can be maintained only by a living individual whose privacy is invaded” (quoting Restatement (Second) of Torts § 652I (1977))); Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984) (“the right of privacy lapses upon death”), H-917 (1976) (“We are . . . of the opinion that the Texas courts would follow the almost uniform rule of other jurisdictions that the right of privacy lapses upon death.”); Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981) (“the right of privacy is personal and lapses upon death”). Accordingly, information pertaining to a deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law privacy grounds. We further note some of the information at issue pertains to individuals who will be de-identified and whose privacy interests are, thus, protected.

Upon review, we find some of the remaining responsive information, which we marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining responsive information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining responsive information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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. Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining responsive 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,

Sarah E. Reese  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

SER/be

Ref: ID# 963159

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)