



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 13, 2015

Mr. Guillermo Trevino  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
1000 Throckmorton Street, Third Floor  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2015-04837

Dear Mr. Trevino:

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# 555228 (PIR No. W038899).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for ten categories of information related to a specified motor vehicle accident. You state the city has released the CR-3 accident report pursuant to section 550.065(c)(4) of the Transportation Code. *See* Transp. Code § 550.065(c)(4) (officer's accident report must be released to person who provides two of following three pieces of information: date of accident; name of any person involved in accident; specific location of accident). You also state the city has no information responsive to a portion of the request.<sup>1</sup> We understand the city will redact certain marked information pursuant to Open Records Letter Nos. 2011-15641 (2011) and 2011-15956 (2011).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

<sup>2</sup>Open Records Letter Nos. 2011-15641 and 2011-15956 are previous determinations issued to the city authorizing the city to withhold the originating telephone numbers and addresses, respectively, of 9-1-1 callers furnished to the city by a service supplier established in accordance with chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 772.218 of the Health and Safety Code without requesting a decision from this office. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a) of the Government Code).

Additionally, we understand the city will withhold insurance policy numbers pursuant to section 552.136(c) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we have marked, is not responsive to the instant request because it was created after the date the request was received. 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 such information in response to this request.

Next, we note the responsive information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(1) provides for the required public disclosure of “a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body[.]” unless it is excepted by section 552.108 of the Government Code or “made confidential under [the Act] or other law[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(1). The information at issue pertains to a completed investigation conducted for the city. This information is subject to section 552.022(a)(1) and must be released unless it is either excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is confidential under the Act or other law. Although you assert this information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code, this section is discretionary and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived). Therefore, the city may not withhold the information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, we will consider the applicability of sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code to the responsive information, as these exceptions make information confidential under the Act.<sup>4</sup>

We note some of the information at issue is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section 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

---

<sup>3</sup>Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact, without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office, the information described in section 552.136(b). Gov’t Code § 552.136(c); *see also id.* § 552.136(d)-(e) (requestor may appeal governmental body’s decision to withhold information under section 552.136(c) to attorney general and governmental body withholding information pursuant to section 552.136(c) must provide certain notice to requestor).

<sup>4</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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 excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 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). However, there is a legitimate public interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 545 (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common-law privacy).

Upon review, we find some of the responsive information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We understand the city will withhold motor vehicle record information under section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.<sup>5</sup> 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 city must withhold the motor vehicle record information you have marked, as well as the information we have marked and any discernible license plates in the submitted video recordings, under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information you have marked, as well as the information we have marked and any discernible license plates in the submitted video recordings, under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining responsive information.

---

<sup>5</sup>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. 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).

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](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,



Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/dls

Ref: ID# 555228

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)