



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 24, 2016

Ms. Natalie Broaddus
Assistant District Attorney
Brazoria County
111 East Locust, Suite 408A
Angleton, Texas 77515

OR2016-23804

Dear Ms. Broaddus:

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# 631659.

The Brazoria County District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident involving a named individual. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure 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 from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority. *See Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978)*. The informer'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 1-2 (1981)* (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common*

Law, § 2374, at 767 (J. 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 (1988). However, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make a report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer's privilege. The privilege excepts the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990). We note the informer's privilege does not apply where the informant's identity is known to the individual who is the subject of the complaint. *See* ORD 208 at 1-2.

You state portions of the submitted information identify complainants who reported violations of law to the Lake Jackson Police Department (the "department"), which is a law enforcement agency located within Brazoria County. You state the subject of the complaint does not know the identities of the individuals at issue. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude the district attorney's office has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to some of the information at issue, which we have marked. Therefore, the district attorney's office may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. However, we find the remaining individuals whose identities you seek to withhold are witnesses who provided information in the course of the investigation. Further, we find the remaining information you marked does not contain any identifying information of an individual. Accordingly, the district attorney's office may not withhold any of the remaining information you marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

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.

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).

Upon review, we find the dates of birth of identifiable public citizens, which we marked, satisfy the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the district attorney's office must withhold the dates of birth we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the remaining date of birth you marked pertains to an individual who has been deidentified, and thus, whose privacy interest is protected. Therefore, none of the remaining information you marked may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the district attorney's office may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. The district attorney's office must withhold the dates of birth we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information must be released.²

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,



Meagan J. Conway
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MJC/akg

²We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. 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). Thus, if the district attorney's office receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the district attorney's office must again seek a decision from this office.

Ref: ID# 631659

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)