



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 2, 2019

Ms. Alicia K. Kreh
Counsel for the Town of Flower Mound
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2019-00011

Dear Ms. Kreh:

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# 750827.

The Town of Flower Mound (the "town"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to three specified incidents. You state the town will redact information pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code and pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You claim some 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.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses the informer's privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. *Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities

¹Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684.

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). 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 information you marked consists of identifying information of complainants who reported possible criminal activities and violations of law to the police. We have no indication the subjects of the complaints know the identities of the complainants. Based upon your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to the information at issue. Therefore, the town may withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. The court of appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). We note, however, the requestor has a right of access to her own date of birth. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) ("person or a person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests"); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning herself). Therefore, the town may not withhold the date of birth you marked under 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

You state the town will withhold certain information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.² Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or

²Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e).

personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. We note, because section 552.130 protects privacy interests, the requestor has a right of access to her own motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.023; ORD 481 at 4. Therefore, the town may not withhold the motor vehicle record information you marked under 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the town may withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. The town must release the remaining information.³

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,



Kieran Hillis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KH/mo

Ref: ID# 750827

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

³We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released under section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023; ORD 481 at 4. Accordingly, if the town receives another request for this same information from a different requestor, the town must again seek a ruling from this office.