



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 23, 2018

Ms. Crystal Briggs
City Secretary
City of Nolanville
101 North 5 Street
Nolanville, Texas 76559

OR2018-01434

Dear Ms. Briggs:

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# 693664.

The City of Nolanville (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to specified complaints. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the city claims 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. The city raises 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.

The city states the submitted information identifies a complainant who reported violations of law to the city's police department (the "department"). Based upon the city's 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. Therefore, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. However, we find the city has not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue identifies an individual who reported a criminal violation to the 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.

Some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.¹ Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. The remaining information contains the cellular telephone number of a city official. Therefore, if the city official whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone

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 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

service, then the city must withhold the city official's cellular telephone number under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, if the city official did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024 or a governmental body pays for the cellular telephone service, the city may not withhold the cellular telephone number at issue under section 552.117(a)(1).

In summary, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. If the city official whose cellular telephone number is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service, then the city must withhold the city official's cellular telephone number under section 552.117(a)(1) 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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 693664

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)