KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 26, 2015

Mr. James Kopp
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283

OR2015-05755

Dear Mr. Kopp:

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# 557802 (COSA File No. W048728).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for a specified offense report. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes a CR-3 accident report that was completed pursuant to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. *See* Transp. Code § 550.064 (officer's accident report). Section 550.065(b) states, 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 release of accident reports to a person who provides two of the following three pieces of information: (1) date of the accident; (2) name of any person involved in the accident; and (3) specific location of the accident. *Id.* § 550.065(c)(4). Under this provision, the Texas Department of Transportation or another governmental entity is required to release a copy of an accident report to a person who provides the agency with two or more pieces of information specified by the statute.

In this instance, the requestor has provided the city with the requisite pieces of information pursuant to section 550.065(c)(4). Although you seek to withhold this information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and under section 552.108 of the Government Code, 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 the Act). Further, when a statute directly conflicts with a common-law principle or claim, the statutory provision controls and preempts 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 the 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, the city may not withhold the CR-3 accident report based on these claims. Accordingly, the city 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.

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). You state the remaining information pertains to a case that is still open. We note, however, the remaining information includes a DIC-24 statutory warning and a DIC-25 notice of suspension. The city provided copies of these forms 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 and DIC-25 forms may not be withheld under section 552.108(a)(1). Based on your representation, however, we conclude section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the remaining information. *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).

Section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). Thus, with the exception of basic information, and the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1).

We understand you to contend the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under common-law privacy. 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 the doctrine of common-law privacy, which 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 established. *See id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation. Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987).

Generally, only highly intimate information implicating the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain situations where the requestor knows the identity of the individual involved, as well as the nature of certain incidents, the entire report must be withheld to protect the individual's privacy. Although you seek to withhold the entirety of the remaining information based on common-law privacy, you have not demonstrated, nor does it otherwise appear, this is a situation in which the information at issue must be withheld in its entirety to protect an individual's privacy interest. However, we agree portions of the remaining information, which we have marked, are highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city must withhold this information pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find none of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing information of no legitimate public interest, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms contain information subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code.[1] Section 552.130 of the Government Code 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must release the submitted CR-3 accident report form pursuant to section 550.065(c)(4) of the Transportation Code. With the exception of the basic information, and the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms, the city may withhold the remaining

---

[1]The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470(1987).

information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. In releasing the remaining information, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. In releasing the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 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,

Lauren Dahlstein
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LMD/som

Ref: ID# 557802

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)