



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 4, 2019

Mr. Peter Gruning  
Counsel for City of Lockhart  
P.O. Box 314  
San Marcos, Texas 78667-0314

OR2019-05940

Dear Mr. Gruning:

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# 759929.

The City of Lockhart (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified address. You claim 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 representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

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. *See Open Records Decision No. 208* at 1-2

---

<sup>1</sup>We 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

(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. Additionally, the privilege is not intended to protect the identities of public officials and employees who have a duty to report violations of the law. Because a public employee acts within the scope of his employment when filing a complaint, the informer's privilege does not protect the public employee's identity. Cf. *United States v. St. Regis Paper Co.*, 328 F. Supp. 660,665 (W.D. Wis. 1971) (concluding public officer may not claim informer's reward for service it is his or her official duty to perform).

You state the information at issue reveals the identity of a complainant who reported possible violations of city ordinances to the city, which is authorized to enforce the ordinances at issue. There is no indication the subject of the complaint knows the identity of the complainant. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude the department has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to some of the information at issue, which we marked. Therefore, 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. However, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining information identifies an individual who reported a criminal violation to the department for purposes of the informer's privilege. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis. The department 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](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 'MJC', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Meagan J. Conway  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MC/gw

Ref: ID# 759929

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)