



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 24, 2015

Mr. James Kopp
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
Office of the City Attorney
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2015-20025

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# 580403 (COSA File No. W089557).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified motor vehicle accident. 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 representative sample of information.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. Act of June 1, 2015, 84th Leg., R.S., ch. 936, § 1, 2015 Tex. Sess. Law Serv. 3256 (Vernon) (to be codified at Transp. Code § 550.065(a)(1)). Chapter 550 requires the creation of a written report when the accident

¹We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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. Transp. Code §§ 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). However, a governmental entity may release an accident report in accordance with subsections (c) and (c-1). Act of June 1, 2015, 84th Leg., R.S., ch. 936, § 1, 2015 Tex. Sess. Law Serv. 3256, 3256-57 (Vernon) (to be codified at Transp. Code § 550.065(c), (c-1)). Section 550.065(c) provides a governmental entity shall release an accident report to a person or entity listed under this subsection. Gov't Code § 550.065(c).

In this instance, the requestor is not a person listed under section 550.065(c). Thus, the submitted accident report is confidential under section 550.065(b), and the city must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code. However, section 550.065(c-1) requires the city to create a redacted accident report that may be requested by any person. *Id.* § 550.065(c-1). The redacted accident report may not include the information listed in subsection (f)(2). *Id.* Therefore, the requestor has a right of access to the redacted accident report. Although the city asserts section 552.108 to withhold the information, a statutory right of access prevails over the Act's general exceptions to public disclosure. *See, e.g.*, 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 exception to disclosure under the Act). Because section 552.108 is a general exception under the Act, the requestor's statutory access under section 550.065(c-1) prevails and the city may not withhold the information under section 552.108 of the Government Code. 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 information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Accordingly, the city must release the redacted accident report to the requestor pursuant to section 550.065(c-1) of the Transportation Code.

Next, we note the remaining information includes court-filed documents that are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(17) provides for the required public disclosure of "information that is also contained in a public court record" unless it is "made confidential under [the Act] or other law[.]" Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). Although you raise section 552.108 of the Government Code, this is a discretionary exception and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). As

such, section 552.108 does not make information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, the marked court-filed documents may not be withheld under section 552.108. You also seek to withhold the information at issue, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. We note common-law privacy is not applicable to information contained in public court records. *See Star-Telegram v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54 (Tex. 1992). Therefore, no portion of the marked court-filed documents may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, as section 552.130 of the Government Code makes information confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a)(17), we will address the applicability of section 552.130 for the marked court-filed documents.²

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(a)(1) 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 release of the information at issue will interfere with a pending criminal investigation and prosecution. Based on this representation, we conclude section 552.108(a)(1) is generally applicable in this instance. *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). We note, however, the information at issue 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).

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). Accordingly, with the exception of the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms and basic information, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

²The 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).

You claim section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy for the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms and the basic information. Section 552.101 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.³ *Texas 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 birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3. Thus, the city must withhold the public citizen's date of birth in the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms under section 552.101 of the Government Code. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information at issue satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information in the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms and basic information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

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 in the marked court-filed documents and the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must release a redacted copy of the CR-3 report pursuant to section 550.065(c-1) of the Transportation Code. The city must release the court-filed documents we have marked pursuant to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. With the exception of the DIC-24 and DIC-25 and basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the

³Section 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).

Government Code. In releasing the marked court-filed documents and the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must also withhold the private citizen's date of birth from the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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,



Nicholas A. Ybarra
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NAY/cbz

Ref: ID# 580403

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)