



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 15, 2019

Ms. Vanessa A. Gonzalez  
Counsel for Baylor University  
Bickerstaff Heath Delgado Acosta LLP  
3711 South MoPac Expressway, Building One, Suite 300  
Austin, Texas 78746

OR2019-01293

Dear Ms. Gonzalez:

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# 746005 (ORR# 18-146).

The Baylor University Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the submitted arguments 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. Section 552.101 encompasses the common-law informer's privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. *See 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 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 Nos. 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1-2 (1978)*. The 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." *See Open Records Decision No. 279 at 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 4–5. The privilege protects the informer’s statement only to the extent necessary to protect the informer’s identity. See Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990).

You state the submitted information reveals the identity of a complainant who reported a possible violation of law that carries criminal penalties to the department. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the department may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege.<sup>1</sup> However, you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of the informer’s privilege to any of the remaining information and the department may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation. Id.* at 683. Upon review, the department has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the department may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege. The department must release the remaining information.<sup>2</sup>

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.

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

<sup>2</sup>We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. See Gov’t Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person’s agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Thus, if the department receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the department must again seek a decision from this office.

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](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 that reads "D. Michelle Case". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

D. Michelle Case  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DMC/mo

Ref: ID# 746005

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)