



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 14, 2022

Ms. Bridgette A. Begle
Attorney for the City of Stafford
Olson & Olson, LLP
Wortham Tower, Suite 600
2727 Allen Parkway
Houston, Texas 77019-2133

OR2022-31675

Dear Ms. Begle:

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# 975375 (Ref. No. COS-PD-577-2022).

The City of Stafford (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You state you will redact motor vehicle record information under section 552.130(c) of the Government Code, account numbers pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code, social security numbers under section 552.147(b) of the Government Code, and information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.1085 of the Government Code. You also state you notified a named individual of the request for information and of the right to submit

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). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination issued by this office authorizing all governmental bodies to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released.² *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, 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. *See id.* § 552.301. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. *See id.* § 552.301(b). Pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body must submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *See id.* § 552.301(e). The city states, and provides documentation showing, it received the instant request for information on July 6, 2022. Accordingly, the city was required to provide the information required by section 552.301(b) by July 20, 2022. However, you did not request a ruling from this office until July 25, 2022. *See id.* § 552.308(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Further, we note the city has submitted the video recordings at issue on a disc; however, the information was submitted in a format we are unable to view. The city must submit information in a manner that enables this office to determine whether the information comes within the scope of an exception to disclosure. Accordingly, we conclude the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301 of the Government Code.

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 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). Although you raise exceptions to disclosure, because this office is unable to review the recordings submitted by the city, we have no basis for finding any of portion of the information at issue excepted from disclosure. Thus, we have no choice but to order the submitted video recordings released pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code. If you believe the information may not lawfully be released, you must challenge this ruling in court pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. Further, although you claim section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege for the remaining information, we find you have failed to establish a compelling reason to address this argument. However, because section 552.1085 of the Government Code and your

² As of the date of this letter, we have not received any comments from the named individual explaining why any portion of the submitted information should not be released to the requestor.

remaining arguments under 552.101 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider your remaining arguments for the remaining information.

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 information protected by other statutes, such as section 11(a) of article 49.25 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which reads as follows:

The medical examiner shall keep full and complete records properly indexed, giving the name if known of every person whose death is investigated, the place where the body was found, the date, the cause and manner of death, and shall issue a death certificate. . . . The records may not be withheld, subject to a discretionary exception under [the Act], except that a photograph or x-ray of a body taken during an autopsy is excepted from required public disclosure in accordance with [the Act], but is subject to disclosure:

- (1) under a subpoena or authority of other law; or
- (2) if the photograph or x-ray is of the body of a person who died while in the custody of law enforcement.

Crim. Proc. Code art. 49.25, § 11(a). Upon review, we find some of the submitted information consists of photographs of a body taken during an autopsy. We have no indication either of the statutory exceptions to confidentiality is applicable in this instance. Accordingly, we find the city must withhold the photographs we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 11 of article 49.25 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.³

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 411.083 of the Government Code, which pertains to criminal history record information (“CHRI”). CHRI generated by the National Crime Information Center (“NCIC”) or by the Texas Crime Information Center is confidential under federal and state law. CHRI means “information collected about a person by a criminal justice agency that consists of identifiable descriptions and notations of arrests, detentions, indictments, informations, and other formal criminal charges and their dispositions.” Gov’t Code § 411.082(2). Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI obtained from the NCIC network or other states. *See* 28 C.F.R. § 20.21. The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual law with respect to CHRI it generates. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990); *see generally* Gov’t Code ch. 411 subch. F. Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI the Texas Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains, except DPS may disseminate this information as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F, or subchapter E-1, of the Government Code. *See* Gov’t Code § 411.083. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) authorize a

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* § 411.089(b)(1). Thus, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Government Code chapter 411. We note Federal Bureau of Investigation (“FBI”) numbers constitute CHRI generated by the FBI. You assert section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code for some of the remaining information. Upon review, we find the information we have marked consists of CHRI which the city must withhold under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law.

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 found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (employee’s designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). The 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 conclude some of the remaining information meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold all public citizens’ dates of birth and the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

Section 552.1085 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part, the following:

- (c) A sensitive crime scene image in the custody of a governmental body is confidential and excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 and a governmental body may not permit a person to view or copy the image except as provided by this section. This section applies to any sensitive crime scene image regardless of the date that the image was taken or recorded.

Gov't Code § 552.1085(c). For purposes of section 552.1085, “sensitive crime scene image” means “a photograph or video recording taken at a crime scene, contained in or part of a closed criminal case, that depicts a deceased person in a state of dismemberment, decapitation, or similar mutilation or that depicts the deceased person’s genitalia.” *See id.* § 552.1085(a)(6). The city argues the remaining photographs consist of sensitive crime scene images. Upon review, however, we find none of the remaining information at issue consists of sensitive crime scene images for the purposes of section 552.1085. Therefore, the city may not withhold the remaining information at issue under section 552.1085(c) of the Government Code.

In summary, the submitted video recordings must be released pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the photographs we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 11 of article 49.25 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.083 of the Government Code and federal law. The city must withhold all public citizens’ dates of birth and the information we have 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,

Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/pt

Ref: ID# 975375

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)