



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 19, 2022

Mr. Mehran Jadidi
Assistant City Attorney
City of Galveston
P.O. Box 779
Galveston, Texas 77553-0779

OR2022-24933

Dear Mr. Jadidi:

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# 967412.

The City of Galveston (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. We note you have redacted motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information contains a police officer's body worn camera recording. 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(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;

¹ 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).

(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 recording at issue 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 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 must address the city’s obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to subsection 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.301(b). The city received the request for information on May 27, 2022. We understand the city was closed on May 30, 2022, in observance of the Memorial Day holiday. This office does not count holidays for the purpose of calculating a governmental body’s deadlines under the Act. Accordingly, you were required to provide the remaining information required by subsection 552.301(b) by June 13, 2022. However, we note the envelope in which your request for ruling was sent bears a postmark of June 14, 2022. *See id.* § 552.308 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail). Consequently, we find the city failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 in requesting this decision from our office with respect to the remaining information.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body’s failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). Because section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address this section for the remaining information.³ However, we find you have failed to establish a compelling reason to address your claimed exception.

² As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your argument against disclosure of this information.

³ The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Additionally, we cannot discern the nature of the remaining redacted information. Thus, the city has failed to comply with section 552.301 with respect to that information, and such information is presumed public under section 552.302. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D), .302. Accordingly, to the extent the remaining redacted information does not consist of audible motor vehicle record information, we conclude the city must release the remaining redacted information to the requestor. If you believe the redacted information is confidential and may not lawfully be released, you must challenge this ruling in court pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code.

Further, we note you have not submitted information responsive to the requested 9-1-1 audio. To the extent any additional information responsive to the request existed on the date the city received the request, we assume you have released it. If you have not released any such information, you must do so at this time. *See id.* §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

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. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. However, because privacy is a personal right that lapses at death, the common-law right to privacy does not encompass information that relates only to a deceased individual. Thus, information pertaining to a deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law privacy grounds. *See 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* Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981) (privacy rights lapse upon death). 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.). 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 date of birth we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the body worn camera recording at issue 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 the city must withhold the date of birth we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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# 967412

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)