



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 28, 2016

Mr. Robert L. Dillard, III
Counsel for the City of University Park
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, LLP
1800 Ross Tower
500 North Akard Street
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2016-09615

Dear Mr. Dillard:

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# 607692 (Ref. No. 75619).

The University Park Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for (1) information pertaining to a specified incident involving the requestor's daughter and (2) all information from a specific date range pertaining to a specific address and any children from the address. The department states it has released some information. The department claims Exhibit C is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the department claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes department police officer's body worn camera recordings. Chapter 1701 provides the procedures a requestor must follow when seeking a body worn camera recording. Section 1701.661(a) provides:

A member of the public is required to provide the following information when submitting a written request to a law enforcement agency for information recorded by a body worn camera:

- (1) the date and approximate time of the recording;
- (2) the specific location where the recording occurred; and

(3) the name of one or more persons known to be a subject of the recording.

Occ. Code § 1701.661(a). In this instance, the requestor does not give the requisite information under section 1701.661(a). As the requestor did not properly request the body worn camera recordings at issue pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released. However, pursuant to section 1701.661(b), a “failure to provide all the information required by Subsection (a) to be part of a request for recorded information does not preclude the requestor from making a future request for the same recorded information.” *Id.* 1701.661(b).

Next, we note the remaining submitted information may have been the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2016-03734 (2016). We have no indication the law, facts, or circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have changed. Thus, to the extent the information at issue is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon, the department must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2016-03734 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information at issue in accordance with that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in a prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). However, to the extent the information at issue is not subject to the previous ruling, we will address the department’s arguments against disclosure.

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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 58.007 of the Family Code. Section 58.007 makes confidential juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997. The relevant language of section 58.007 reads as follows:

(c) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records and files concerning a child and information stored, by electronic means or otherwise, concerning the child from which a record or file could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult files and records;

(2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as records or files relating to adults, be accessible under controls that are separate and distinct from controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and

(3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subchapters B, D, and E.

...

(e) Law enforcement records and files concerning a child may be inspected or copied by a juvenile justice agency as that term is defined by Section 58.101, a criminal justice agency as that term is defined by Section 411.082, Government Code, the child, and the child's parent or guardian.

...

(j) Before a child or a child's parent or guardian may inspect or copy a record or file concerning the child under Subsection (e), the custodian of the record or file shall redact:

(1) any personally identifiable information about a juvenile suspect, offender, victim, or witness who is not the child; and

(2) any information that is excepted from required disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code, or other law.

Fam. Code § 58.007(c), (e), (j). For purposes of section 58.007(c), "child" means a person who is ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age at the time of the reported conduct. *See id.* § 51.02(2). Report numbers 16-00132 and 16-0003372 and Exhibit C involve juvenile delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision that occurred after September 1, 1997. *See id.* § 51.03 (defining "delinquent conduct" and "conduct indicating a need for supervision" for purposes of Fam. Code § 58.007). Thus, this information is generally confidential under section 58.007(c). However, in this instance, the requestor is a parent of one of the juvenile offenders listed in the information at issue and, thus, has a right to inspect information concerning the child under section 58.007(e). *Id.* § 58.007(e). However, section 58.007(j)(1) provides any personally identifiable information about a juvenile suspect, offender, victim, or witness who is not the requestor's child must be redacted. *See id.* § 58.007(j)(1). Thus, the department must withhold the personally identifiable information we have marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(j)(1) of the Family Code. Further, section 58.007(j)(2) provides information subject to any other exception to disclosure under the Act or other law must be redacted. *See id.* § 58.007(j)(2). Thus, we will address whether the information is otherwise excepted from disclosure under the Act.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). 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.¹ *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.

We note the requestor has a right of access to her own date of birth, as well as to the date of birth of her minor child, under section 552.023 of the Government Code. Thus, these dates of birth may not be withheld from the requestor under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Upon review, we find the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or 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.² Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Accordingly, the department must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked and indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, as the requestor did not properly request the body worn camera recordings at issue pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released. To the extent the information at issue is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon, the department must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2016-03734 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information at issue in accordance with that ruling. The department must withhold the personally identifiable information we have marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(j)(1) of the

¹Section 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).

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).

Family Code. The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked and indicated under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The department must release the remaining information.³

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,



Rahat Huq
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RSH/som

Ref: ID# 607692

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

³We note the requestor has a special right of access to information being released. *See* Fam. Code §§ 58.007(e), 261.201(k); Gov't Code § 552.023. If the department receives another request for this information from a different requestor, then the department should again seek a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001).