



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 21, 2022

Mr. Nico Arias
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
200 Texas Street, 3rd Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2022-29058

Dear Mr. Arias:

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# 973684 (PIR No. E003770).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for any and all information pertaining to a specified case number. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Additionally, we note the city provides documentation showing it notified an individual of the right to submit comments to this office explaining why the information at issue should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have considered the claimed exception and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note you have submitted only photographs and dashboard camera recordings, which includes audio from an officer's body worn camera recording, in response to the request for information. To the extent any additional information responsive to the request existed on the date the city received the request, we assume the city has released it. If the city has not released any such information, it 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).

Next, we note the submitted information includes an audio recording from a peace 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) of the Occupations Code provides the following:

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 recording 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.¹ *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 excepts from public 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 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. *See 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

¹ As we are able to make this determination, we need not address the argument against disclosure of this information.

intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 5 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). However, because privacy is a personal right that lapses at death, the constitutional right to privacy does not encompass information that relates only to a deceased individual. *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). Nevertheless, the United States Supreme Court has determined that surviving family members can have a privacy interest in information relating to their deceased relatives. *See Nat’l Archives & Records Admin. v. Favish*, 541 U.S. 157 (2004).

In this instance, portions of the remaining information relate to a deceased individual. Therefore, this information may not be withheld from disclosure based on the deceased individual’s privacy interests. However, you indicate the city notified the deceased individual’s next of kin of the request for information and of the next of kin’s right to assert a privacy interest in the information at issue. As of this date, we have not received correspondence from any of the deceased’s family members asserting a privacy interest in the information. Thus, we have no basis for determining a family member has a privacy interest in the information at issue. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy and the holding in *Favish*.

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.² *See* Gov’t Code § 552.130. Accordingly, we find the city must withhold all visible license plates within the remaining information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, as the body worn camera recording 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 all visible license plates within the remaining information under section 552.130 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.

² 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).

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,

James M. Graham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JMG/jxd

Ref: ID# 973684

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

cc: Third Party
(w/o enclosures)