



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 14, 2014

Mr. Daniel Ortiz
Assistant City Attorney
City of El Paso
P.O. Box 1890
El Paso, Texas 79950-1890

OR2014-00837

Dear Mr. Ortiz:

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# 510894 (13-1026-3662, W001818-102113).

The El Paso Police Department (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to a specified accident. You state you have released some of the responsive information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code. The Office of the District Attorney for the 34th Judicial District (the "district attorney's office") also claims the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information contains a CR-3 accident report form. Section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code states that except as provided by subsection (c) or (e), accident reports are privileged and for the confidential use of certain specified entities. Transp. Code § 550.065(b). The submitted CR-3 crash report was completed pursuant to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. *See id.* § 550.064 (officer's accident report). 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 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 two or more pieces of information specified by the statute. *Id.* In this instance, the requestor has provided the department with the requisite information for the CR-3 crash report. You seek to withhold the CR-3 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, and under sections 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office. As a general rule, statutes governing the release of specific information prevail over the general exceptions to disclosure found in the Act. *See* Attorney General Opinion DM-146 at 3 (1992); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 613 at 4 (1993) (exceptions in Act cannot impinge on statutory right of access to information), 451 (1986) (specific statutory right of access provisions overcome general exceptions to disclosure under Act). Sections 552.103 and 552.108 are general exceptions to required public disclosure under the Act. Further, when a statute directly conflicts with a common-law principle or claim, the statutory provision controls and preempts the common-law. *See Collins v. Tex Mall, L.P.*, 297 S.W.3d 409, 415 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2009, no pet.) (statutory provision controls and preempts common-law only when statute directly conflicts with common-law principle); *CenterPoint Energy Houston Elec. LLC v. Harris County Toll Rd.*, 436 F.3d 541, 544 (5th Cir. 2006) (common-law controls only where there is no conflicting or controlling statutory law). Thus, we need not consider the applicability of common-law privacy or sections 552.103 and 552.108, and the department may not withhold the CR-3 based on those claims.

You also assert portions of the CR-3 accident report are confidential under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 excepts from disclosure 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 county. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1)-(2). As previously noted a statutory right of access generally prevails over the Act's general exceptions to disclosure. *See* ORDs 613 at 4, 451. However, because section 552.130 has its own access provisions, we conclude section 552.130 is not a general exception under the Act. Thus, we must address the conflict between the access provided under section 550.065 of the Transportation Code and the confidentiality provided under section 552.130. Where information falls within both a general and a specific provision of law, the specific provision prevails over the general. *See Horizon/CMS Healthcare Corp. v. Auld*, 34 S.W.3d 887, 901 (Tex. 2000) ("more specific statute controls over the more general"); *Cuellar v. State*, 521 S.W.2d 277 (Tex. Crim. App. 1975) (under well-established rule of statutory construction, specific statutory provisions prevail over general ones); Open Records Decision Nos. 598 (1991), 583 (1990), 451.

In this instance, section 550.065 specifically provides access only to accident reports of the type at issue in this request, while section 552.130 generally excepts motor vehicle record information maintained in any context. Thus, we conclude the access to accident reports provided under section 550.065 is more specific than the general confidentiality provided under section 552.130. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any portion of the CR-3 accident report under section 552.130.

Finally, you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy for the CR-3 accident report. Under the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution, the United States Constitution and duly-enacted federal statutes are “the supreme law of the Land,” and states have a responsibility to enforce federal law. *See* U.S. Const., art. VI, cl. 2; *Howlett v. Rose*, 496 U.S. 356, 367-69 (1990). As a federal law, constitutional privacy preempts any conflicting state provisions, including section 560.065 of the Transportation Code. *See Equal Employment Opportunity Comm’n v. City of Orange, Tex.*, 905 F. Supp. 381, 382 (E.D. Tex. 1995) (federal law prevails over inconsistent provision of state law). Thus, we will address your argument under section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional privacy for the CR-3 accident report.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy, which 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. 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 information must concern the “most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 5; *see Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the submitted CR-3 accident report falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual’s privacy interests for the purposes of constitutional privacy. Thus, the department may not withhold the submitted CR-3 accident report under section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional privacy. Therefore, the department must release the submitted CR-3 accident report form in its entirety to the requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c)(4).

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime [if] release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). Both the department and the district attorney’s office represent that release of the remaining submitted information will interfere with a pending criminal prosecution. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Based on this representation, we conclude that section 552.108(a)(1) is generally applicable in this instance. We note, however, that the information at issue includes a DIC-24 statutory warning. The department provided a copy of this form to the arrestee. You have not explained how releasing this

information, which has already been seen by the arrestee, would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). Accordingly, the DIC-24 form may not be withheld under section 552.108.

Additionally, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure “basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.” *Id.* § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic “front-page” information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-187; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). We note basic information does not include information subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code §552.130; *see also* ORD 127. Accordingly, with the exception of the DIC-24 form and basic information, the department may withhold the remaining submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.¹

You claim the DIC-24 form and the basic information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law and constitutional privacy. Common-law privacy protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *See 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. As noted above, 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. ORD 455 at 4.

Upon review, we find the department has failed to demonstrate any portion of the DIC-24 form or the basic information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, no portion of the DIC-24 form or the basic information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. Furthermore, we find the department has failed to demonstrate any portion of the DIC-24 form or the basic information falls within the constitutional zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, no portion of the DIC-24 form or the basic information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

Next, section 552.103 of the Government Code provides:

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your argument under section 552.130 for this information.

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

We note the purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information related to litigation through the discovery process. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5. Thus, any information obtained from or provided to all other parties in the anticipated or pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. The submitted DIC-24 form was provided to the arrestee; thus, the DIC-24 form was inevitably seen by the opposing party to the litigation. Furthermore, basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle* is generally not excepted from public disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Open Records Decision No. 597 (1991). Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note that the DIC-24 form contains information subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code. As noted above, section 552.130 provides that information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state or

another state or country is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1). The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130.²

In summary, the department must release the submitted CR-3 accident report form in its entirety to the requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c)(4) of the Transportation Code. Except for the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code, which must be withheld, the DIC-24 form must be released. Except for basic information, which must be released, the department may withhold the remaining submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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,



Tamara H. Holland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

THH/ac

Ref: ID# 510894

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

²We note 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).