



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 26, 2019

Ms. L. Carolyn Nivens  
Counsel for the City of Seabrook  
Ross, Banks, May, Cron & Cavin, P.C.  
7700 San Felipe Street, Suite 550  
Houston, Texas 77063

OR2019-08243

Dear Ms. Nivens:

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# 763313 (File No. 3957).

The City of Seabrook (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for specified complaint reports. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You indicate you will withhold information under section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> You claim portions of the submitted information are 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 section encompasses 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

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 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).

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.

You claim the informer's privilege for the identities of complainants who reported alleged violations of article 5 of the Seabrook City Code to the city's police department. You state you have no indication the identities of the complainants are already known. We understand a violation of the article at issue is punishable by a fine. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude you have demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to most of the information you have marked. Therefore, with the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. Upon review, however, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information you have marked identifies informers for purposes of the common-law informer's privilege. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information 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 Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See 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 the individuals whose dates of birth you seek to withhold have been de-identified pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. Therefore, the privacy interest in these dates of birth are sufficiently protected, and the city may not withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, with the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. 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](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,



Tim Neal  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TN/mo

Ref: ID# 763313

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)