



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 3, 2022

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

OR2022-30410

Dear Mr. Mullins:

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# 975731 (ORR# P009134-071222).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for body worn camera recordings pertaining to a specified incident. You state the city will withhold motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and access device numbers pursuant to section 552.136(c) of the Government Code.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

¹ Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 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). Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See id.* § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e).

² We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988)*. This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

Initially, we note the requestor seeks only body worn camera recordings pertaining to the specified incident. The city has submitted documents that contain information beyond these specific pieces of information. Thus, the portions of the submitted information that do not consist of the information requested are not responsive to the present request. 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.³

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. The responsive information consists of video recordings from the body worn video cameras of police officers of the department. 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;
- (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 the requestor provided the information required by section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code for release of the body worn camera recordings. However, section 1701.661(f) provides, in relevant part:

A law enforcement agency may not release any portion of a recording made in a private space . . . without written authorization from the person who is the subject of that portion of the recording or, if the person is deceased, from the person’s authorized representative.

Id. § 1701.661(f). Upon review, we agree portions of the submitted body worn camera recordings were made in a private space. *See id.* § 1701.651(3) (defining “private space” for purposes of section 1701.661 (f)). The city states it does not have written authorization for release of the recordings from all of the subjects of the recordings. *See id.* § 1701.661(f). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have indicated under section

³ As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.661(f) of the Occupations Code.⁴

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the constitutional right to privacy. Constitutional privacy protects two kinds of interests. *See Whalen v. Roe*, 429 U.S. 589, 599-600 (1977); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 3-5 (1992), 478 at 4 (1987), 455 at 3-7 (1987). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the “zones of privacy,” pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education, that have been recognized by the United States Supreme Court. *See Fado v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172 (5th Cir. 1981); ORD 455 at 3-7. The second constitutionally protected privacy interest is in freedom from public disclosure of certain personal matters. *See Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir.1985); ORD 455 at 6-7. This aspect of constitutional privacy balances the individual’s privacy interest against the public’s interest in the information. *See* ORD 455 at 7. Constitutional privacy under section 552.101 is reserved for “the most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 8 (quoting *Ramie*, 765 F.2d at 492). We note the right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death and therefore may not be asserted solely on behalf of 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.); Open Records Decision No. 272 (1981). However, 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).

Because the submitted videos relate to deceased individuals, they may not be withheld from disclosure based on the deceased individuals’ privacy interests. However, the city states it has notified a family member of the deceased individuals of the request for information and of the right to assert a privacy interest in the information at issue. After reviewing the submitted comments and the information at issue, we find the family’s privacy interest in the images at issue outweighs the public’s interest in the disclosure of this information. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy and the holding in *Favish*.

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. 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

⁴ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). We note that because “the right of privacy is purely personal[,]” that right “terminates upon the death of the person whose privacy is invaded[.]” *Moore*, 589 S.W.2d at 491; *see also Justice v. Belo Broadcasting Corp.*, 472 F. Supp. 145, 146-47 (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 § 6251 (1977)); *see* 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.”); ORD 272 at 1. Accordingly, information pertaining to a deceased individual may not be withheld on common-law privacy grounds. Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. We note the requestor has a right of access to her children’s confidential information 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 Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Therefore, the city must withhold the public citizen’s date of birth not belonging to the requestor’s child 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 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 information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.661(f) of the Occupations Code. The city must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy and the holding in *Favish*. The city must withhold the public citizen’s date of birth not belonging to the requestor’s child under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must release the remaining information.⁵

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

⁵ We note the requestor has a right of access to the information being released in this instance. Thus, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001).

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/pt

Ref: ID# 975731

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)