December 20, 2001

Ms. Tamara Pitts  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
1000 Throckmorton Street  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

Dear Ms. Pitts:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 158406.

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for information regarding a barking dog complaint. You claim that the complainant’s identifying information is protected by the informant’s privilege under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." The Texas courts have recognized the informant’s privilege. See Aguilar v. State, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). It protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided that the subject of the information does not already know the informant’s identity. Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informant’s privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." Open Records Decision No. 279 at 2 (1981) (citing Wigmore, Evidence, § 2374, at 767 (McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. See Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4-5 (1988). The privilege excepts the informant’s statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informant’s identity. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990).
You represent to us that the complainant reported a violation of the city’s nuisance ordinance which is a class C misdemeanor. You further indicate that the city’s Animal Control Division is responsible for enforcing the ordinance. We conclude that you may withhold the complainant’s name and telephone number under section 552.101 in conjunction with the informer’s privilege. *See Open Records Decision No. 156 (1977)* (name of person who makes complaint about another individual to city’s animal control division is excepted from disclosure by informer’s privilege so long as information furnished discloses potential violation of state law).

In addition, you request that this office issue a previous determination related to the withholding, under section 552.101 in conjunction with the informer’s privilege, of the identifying information of persons who have made complaints about barking dogs. Therefore, as per your request, this letter ruling shall serve as a previous determination under section 552.301(a) that the identifying information of such a complainant, such as the name, address, and telephone number, is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with the informer’s privilege. *See Open Records Decision No. 673 at 7 (2001).* Moreover, so long as the elements of law, fact and circumstances do not change so as to no longer support the findings set forth above, the city need not ask for a decision from this office again with respect to this type of information requested of the city. *See id.*

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body’s intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss of the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.
If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

Yen-Ha Le
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

YHL/sdk

Ref: ID# 158406

Enc: Submitted document

c: Ms. Gloria Harvey
7804 Driftwood Court
Fort Worth, Texas 76179
(w/o enclosure)