



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 5, 2017

Mr. Christopher K. Austria
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
200 Texas Street, 3rd Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-6311

OR2017-22738

Dear Mr. Austria:

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# 684724 (City PIR No. W064856).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for the identity of the complainant in a specified complaint.¹ You state you will release some information to the requestor. You state you will redact some information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).² You claim portions 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 information.

¹We 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 when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

²Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold specific categories of information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

Initially, we note the requestor only seeks the identity of the complainant. Accordingly, the remaining submitted information is not responsive to the instant request. The city need not release non-responsive information in response to this request, and this ruling will not address that 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. 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 the responsive information identifies a complainant who reported a violation of a city ordinance to the authority responsible for enforcing the relevant portions of the city ordinance. You also state a person found in violation of the ordinance could be punished by a fine. We have no indication the subject of the complaint knows the identity of the complainant. 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 responsive information 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tim Neal". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "T" and "N".

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/tdw

Ref: ID# 684724

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)