



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 21, 2017

Ms. Courtney Alvarez
City Attorney
City of Kingsville
P.O. Box 1458
Kingsville, Texas 78364

OR2017-18975

Dear Ms. Alvarez:

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# 671814 (City ID#2017-568 & 590).

The City of Kingsville (the "city") received two requests for information pertaining to a specified case. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

Initially, we note the requested information includes city police officers' body worn camera recordings. Body worn cameras are subject to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code.

¹Although you failed to timely raise section 552.130 of the Government Code, this provision constitutes a compelling reason to withhold information, and we will consider your argument under this exception. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301, .302.

²We assume that 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.

Chapter 1701 provides the procedures a requestor must follow when seeking a body worn camera recording. Section 1701.661(a) provides:

A member of the public is required to provide the following information when submitting a written request to a law enforcement agency for information recorded by a body worn camera:

- (1) the date and approximate time of the recording;
- (2) the specific location where the recording occurred; and
- (3) the name of one or more persons known to be a subject of the recording.

Occ. Code § 1701.661(a). In this instance, the requestors do not give the requisite information under section 1701.661(a). As the requestors did not properly request the body worn camera recordings at issue pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released.³ However, pursuant to section 1701.661(b), a “failure to provide all the information required by Subsection (a) to be part of a request for recorded information does not preclude the requestor from making a future request for the same recorded information.” *Id.* § 1701.661(b).

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). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state the remaining information pertains to an active criminal investigation or prosecution. Based on your representation, 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, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the remaining information.

However, we note, and you acknowledge, section 552.108 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

³As we are able to make this determination, we do not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 (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 the basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.⁴

You claim some of the basic information is protected by section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. Section 552.101 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 basic information identify a complainant who reported a potential violation of law to the city's police department. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude the city has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to the information at issue. Therefore, the city may withhold the identity of the complainant, which you have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

In summary, as the requestors did not properly request the body worn camera recordings at issue pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information, except to note basic information is generally not excepted from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision No. 597 (1991).

released. With the exception of the basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. In releasing the basic information, the city may withhold the identity of the complainant, which you marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.⁵

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,



Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/eb

Ref: ID# 671814

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁵We note the requestors have a right of access to the information being released. Thus, the city must again seek a decision from this office if it receives a request for this information from a different requestor. *See* Fam. Code § 58.007(e).