



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 15, 2018

Ms. Bianca Johnson
Open Records Coordinator
Dallas Animal Services
City of Dallas
1818 North Westmoreland
Dallas, Texas 75212

OR2018-03680

Dear Ms. Johnson:

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# 698764.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified address. You state you released some information. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

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

¹Although the city also raises Texas Rule of Evidence 508, we need not address this provision as the proper exception to raise when asserting the informer's privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 1-2 (2002).

²We assume 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.

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). 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 submitted information, which you marked, identify a complainant who reported a violation of the city's code using the city's 3-1-1 call system. You inform us the complaint was referred to the city's Department of Code Compliance, which you explain has the authority to enforce the relevant portions of the code. You also state the alleged violation is punishable by fine. There is no indication the subject of the complaint knows the identity of the complainant. Based upon these representations and our review, we conclude the city has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to the identifying information of the complainant. Therefore, the city may withhold the information it marked 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,



Katherine Stark
Attorney
Open Records Division

KS/eb

Ref: ID# 698764

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)