



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 28, 2017

Ms. Norma Duncan
City Secretary
City of Heath
200 Laurence Drive
Heath, Texas 75032

OR2017-14377

Dear Ms. Duncan:

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# 664170.

The City of Heath (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to an incident involving the requestor. You state you have released some information. You claim 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. Section 552.101 encompasses 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* ORD 208 at 1-2.

You assert the submitted information identifies complainants who reported possible criminal violations to the city's police department. We have no indication the subject of the complaints knows the identities of the informers. Further, we note in some circumstances, where an oral statement is captured on tape and the voice of the informant is recognizable, it may be necessary to withhold the entire audio statement to protect the informant's identity. Open Records Decision No. 434 at 2 (1986). Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude the city has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to some of the information at issue, which we have marked and indicated. Therefore, the city may withhold the information we have marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. However, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information consists of the identifying information of an individual who reported a criminal violation to the city's police 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.

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. The court of appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *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.). We note the remaining information includes the date of birth of the requestor. Section 552.023(a) of the Government Code states that a person has a special right of access to information that is excepted from public disclosure under laws intended to protect that person's privacy interest. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning herself). Accordingly, the requestor has a right of access to his date of birth. Therefore, with the exception of the requestor's date of birth, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, 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.¹ See Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked and indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. With the exception of the requestor's date of birth, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city 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/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,



Kaelan A. Henze
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAH/sb

Ref: ID# 664170

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

¹The 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, 480 (1987), 470 (1987).