



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 12, 2017

Mr. Kerry G. Tilley
Assistant City Attorney
City of Amarillo
200 S.E. Third Avenue
Amarillo, Texas 79101-1514

OR2017-07699

Dear Mr. Tilley:

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# 653063 (PIR No. 17-0119-01).

The City of Amarillo (the "city") received a request for all information regarding the requestor's dog. You state the city released some information. 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.

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). Section 552.108 applies only to records created by an agency, or a portion of an agency, whose primary function is to investigate crimes and enforce criminal laws. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 493 (1988), 287 (1981). Section 552.108 generally does not apply to records created by an agency whose chief function is essentially regulatory in nature. Open Records Decision No. 199 (1978). An agency that does not qualify as a law enforcement agency may, under certain limited circumstances, claim section 552.108 protects records in its possession. If an administrative agency's investigation reveals possible criminal conduct the administrative agency intends to report or has already reported to the appropriate law enforcement agency, section 552.108 will apply to information gathered by the

administrative agency if its release would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1); Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision Nos. 493 at 1, 474 (1987), 372 at 4 (1983) (where incident involving allegedly criminal conduct is still under active investigation or prosecution, section 552.108 may be invoked by any proper custodian of information that relates to incident).

We note the information at issue pertains to an investigation of a dangerous dog case. You explain the submitted information consists of records created by the city's Animal Management and Welfare Department (the "department"). You state the department is charged with enforcing the city's animal ordinances and cruel treatment of animal laws. You also state the submitted information pertains to a pending prosecution. Based on these representations and our review, we conclude the release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *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). Thus, we find section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the submitted information.

Section 552.108, however, 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; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). We note basic information includes, among other items, the identity of the complainant. *See* ORD 127 at 3-4. Thus, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

You seek to withhold some of the basic information under section 552.101 in conjunction with the informer's privilege. 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, provided the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. *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, individuals 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).

You state a portion of the basic information identifies an individual who reported alleged violations of section 8-2-5 of the municipal code. You explain officers from the department responded to the call and have the authority to investigate alleged animal violations pursuant to local ordinance and state law. You inform us a violation of the ordinance at issue is punishable by a fine. There is no indication the subject of the complaint knows the identity of the complainant. Based on your representations, we conclude the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. However, none of the remaining information identifies an individual who reported a criminal violation to the department for purposes of the informer's privilege. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

In summary, with the exception of basic information, which the city must release, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. In releasing basic information, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

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,



Britni Ramirez
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BR/som

Ref: ID# 653063

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)