



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 30, 2017

Ms. Elizabeth Reynolds  
Paralegal  
City of Dallas  
1500 Marilla Street, Room 7DN  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2017-11756

Dear Ms. Reynolds:

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# 665777 (ORR# C003236-042717).

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified complaint.<sup>1</sup> You state that the city will release some information. 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 representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>We note the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. See Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); see also *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup>We 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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 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 Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978)*.

You state the information you have marked reveals the identity of a complainant who reported a possible violation of section 7-3.1 of the city’s code to the city’s 3-1-1 call center. You state the complaint was referred to the city’s Animal Services Department, which you explain has the authority to enforce the provision of the code at issue. You also state the alleged violation is punishable by fine. We have no indication the subject of the complaint knows the identity of the complainant. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege.<sup>3</sup> As the city raises no other exceptions to disclosure of the remaining information, it must release the remaining information.

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/>

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of the information at issue.

[url\\_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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Paige Thompson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "P" and "T".

Paige Thompson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PT/eb

Ref: ID# 665777

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)