



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 27, 2013

Ms. Nan Rodriguez
Deputy City Attorney
City of Temple
2 North Main Street, Suite 308
Temple, Texas 76501

OR2013-16865

Dear Ms. Rodriguez:

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# 500600.

The Temple Police Department (the "department") received a request for all information pertaining to a specified incident. You state the department has released some information to the requestor. You claim the remaining 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 information.

Initially, we must address the department'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 section 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). You inform us the department received the request for information on July 8, 2013. You do not inform us the department was closed for any business days between July 8, 2013, and July 22, 2013. Accordingly, you were required to provide the information required by subsection 552.301(b) by July 22, 2103. However, the envelope in which the department provided the information required by section 552.301(b) was postmarked July 23, 2013. *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). Accordingly, we conclude the department

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); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a governmental body may demonstrate a compelling reason to withhold information by showing that the information is made confidential by another source of law or affects third party interests. *See* ORD 630. Because sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to overcome this presumption, we will address the applicability of these exceptions to the submitted information.

We understand the department has redacted driver's license numbers in accordance with section 552.130 of the Government Code and social security numbers under section 552.147 of the Government Code.¹ However, we note you have also redacted the home addresses and telephone numbers of individual citizens. You do not assert, nor does our review of the records indicate, you have been authorized to withhold this information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). Therefore, this information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether the information comes within the scope of an exception to disclosure. In this instance, we can discern the nature of the redacted information; thus, being deprived of that information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. In the future, however, the department should refrain from redacting any information it is not authorized to withhold in seeking an open records ruling. Failure to do so may result in the presumption the redacted information is public. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302.

The submitted information includes a CR-3 accident report form completed pursuant to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. *See* Transp. Code § 550.064 (officer's accident report). Section 550.065(b) states that, except as provided by subsection (c) or subsection (e), accident reports are privileged and confidential. *Id.* § 550.065(b). Section 550.065(c)(4) provides for the release of accident reports to a person who provides two of the following three pieces of information: (1) the date of the accident; (2) the name of any person involved

¹Section 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* Act of May 6, 2013, 83rd Leg., R.S., S.B. 458, § 1 (to be codified as an amendment to 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* Gov't Code § 552.130(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).

in the accident; and (3) the specific location of the accident. *Id.* § 550.065(c)(4). Under this provision, a governmental entity is required to release a copy of an accident report to a person who provides the agency with two or more of the items of information specified by the statute. *Id.* In this instance, the requestor has provided the department with the requisite pieces of information. Accordingly, the department must release the submitted CR-3 accident report to the requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c)(4) of the Transportation Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “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. We note an individual’s name, address, and telephone number are generally not private information under common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision No. 554 at 3 (1990) (disclosure of person’s name, address, or telephone number not an invasion of privacy). Moreover, because the common-law right to privacy is a personal right that lapses at death, common-law privacy does not protect information that relates only to a deceased individual. *Moore v. Charles B. Pierce Film Enters., Inc.*, 589 S.W.2d 489, 491 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1979, writ ref’d n.r.e.); see also Attorney General Opinions JM-229 (1984), H-917; Open Records Decision No. 272 at 1 (1981). Upon review, we find the information at issue is not highly intimate or embarrassing information of no legitimate public concern and may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the constitutional right to privacy, which 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 *Fadjo 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). As previously noted, 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*, 589 S.W.2d at 491; ORD 272 at 1. 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).

In this instance, you inform us you have notified the family members of the deceased individual whose information is at issue of the request for information and of their right to assert a privacy interest in the submitted information. As of the date of this decision, we have not received any correspondence from the family members of the deceased individual. Thus, we have no basis for determining the family members' privacy interest in the submitted information. Therefore, this information may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional 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 issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See Gov't Code* § 552.130. Upon review, we find portions of the remaining submitted information consist of driver's license information. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department must release the submitted CR-3 accident report to the requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c)(4) of the Transportation Code. The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The department 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 http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Cynthia G. Tynan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CGT/ag

Ref: ID# 500600

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)