



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 18, 2017

Ms. Jo Ann Pate
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
200 Texas Street, Third Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2017-21304

Dear Ms. Pate:

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# 675906 (City PIR No. W063030).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for all e-mails from a named employee, sent during a specified time containing specified terms. You state you will release some information. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted e-mails, which we marked, are not responsive to the instant request for information because they do not contain any of the specified terms. This

¹We note the city also claims the informer's privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 508. The Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022 of the Government Code. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001); *see also* Gov't Code § 552.022(a). In this instance, section 552.022 is not applicable to the information the city seeks to withhold under the informer's privilege. Therefore, we do not address the city's argument under rule 508.

ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the city is not required to release such information in response to this request.

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 responsive information identify complainants who reported violations of the Penal Code to city officials charged with enforcing those laws. You state there is no indication the subjects of the complaints know the identities of the informers. 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 you marked. Therefore, 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. The city must release the remaining responsive 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Meagan J. Conway', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Meagan J. Conway
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MC/sb

Ref: ID# 675906

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)