



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 29, 2016

Ms. Judy Hickman
Assistant Supervisor
Beaumont Police Department
P.O. Box 3827
Beaumont, Texas 77704

OR2016-19464

Dear Ms. Hickman:

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# 624347.

The Beaumont Police Department (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to a specified accident. The department states it has released or will release some of the requested information, but claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, 552.130, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108(a) 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: (1) 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(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the information at issue 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, 710 (Tex. 1977). The department states the submitted recordings contain information that relates to a pending criminal investigation or prosecution. Based on this representation, we conclude the release of this information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177, 186-87 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (delineating law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). The department also represents it lacks the technical capability to redact the information subject to section 552.108 from the recordings.

Based on this representation, we conclude the department may withhold the submitted video recordings in their entirety under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.¹

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. Section 552.101 encompasses information subject to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. Section 550.065 applies only to a written report of an accident required under section 550.061, 550.062, or 601.004. Transp. Code § 550.065(a)(1). Chapter 550 requires the creation of a written report when the accident resulted in injury to or the death of a person or damage to the property of any person to the apparent extent of \$1,000 or more. *Id.* §§ 550.061 (operator’s accident report), .062 (officer’s accident report). An accident report is privileged and for the confidential use of the Texas Department of Transportation or a local governmental agency of Texas that has use for the information for accident prevention purposes. *Id.* § 550.065(b). The department asserts some of the remaining information is confidential under section 550.065. However, the information at issue does not contain a written report of an accident required under section 550.061, 550.062, or 601.004 of the Transportation Code. *See id.* § 550.065(a)(1). Accordingly, the remaining information is not confidential under section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code, and the department may not withhold any of it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground.

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. Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. In considering whether a public citizen’s date of birth is private, the Third Court of Appeals looked to the supreme court’s rationale in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of Texas*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). *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.). The supreme court concluded public employees’ dates of birth are private under section 552.102 of the Government Code because the employees’ privacy interest substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in disclosure.² *Tex. Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Texas Comptroller*, the court of appeals concluded the privacy rights of public employees apply equally to public citizens, and thus, public citizens’ dates of

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address the other arguments of the department to withhold this information.

²Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a).

birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3. We agree the department must withhold the dates of birth it has marked, as well the date of birth we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department also seeks to withhold the telephone numbers of drivers involved in the accident at issue, which it has marked, on that ground. However, we find this information does not satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the marked telephone numbers are not confidential under common-law privacy, and the department may not withhold them under section 552.101 on that ground.

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, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. The department must withhold the motor vehicle record information it has marked, as well as the information we have marked, under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body" unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee's work e-mail address because such an address is not that of the employee as a "member of the public," but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. The e-mail address at issue does not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c), and the department does not inform us a member of the public has affirmatively consented to its release. Therefore, the department must withhold the e-mail address it has marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

To conclude, the department may withhold the submitted video recordings in their entirety under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The department must withhold the dates of birth marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must also withhold the information marked under sections 552.130 and 552.137 of the Government Code. The department must release the remaining information.³

³The requestor has a right of access to motor vehicle record information in the documents to be released. 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). Therefore, if the department receives another request for this information, section 552.130(c) authorizes the department to redact the marked motor vehicle record information without requesting another ruling from this office.

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,



James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/bhf

Ref: ID# 624347

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)