



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 16, 2019

Mr. Ryan D. Pittman
Counsel for the City of Frisco
Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd, Hullett
1700 Redbud Boulevard, Suite 300
Frisco, Texas 75070-1210

OR2019-13100

Dear Mr. Pittman:

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# 772327 (Ref. No. P033123).

The City of Frisco (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for 1) information pertaining to a specified incident, 2) noise complaints made for two specified addresses during a specified time period, and 3) noise complaints filed by a named individual during a specified time period. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information consists of completed investigation that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the submitted information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. Although you raise section 552.103 of the Government Code for the submitted information, this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive Gov't Code § 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, none of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) may be withheld under section 552.103. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the common-law informer's privilege is "other law" for the purpose of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001); *Tex. Comm'n on Envtl. Quality v. Abbott*, No. GB-300417 (126th Dist. Ct, Travis County, Tex.). Thus, we will consider your argument the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to the submitted information. Additionally, we will consider your arguments to withhold this information under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. *See Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1)*.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A); Open Records Decision No. 434 (1986). You state the submitted information pertains to criminal investigations that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on this representation, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the submitted information.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure "basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime." Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic "front-page" information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). *See also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). We note basic information does not include dates of birth or motor vehicle record information encompassed by section 552.130 of the Government Code. *See* ORD 127 at 3-4. Accordingly, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.¹

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this 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. *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 from disclosure 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 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).

You state the basic information reveals the identities of complainants who reported possible violations of a city ordinance that carries civil and criminal penalties to the city, which is authorized to enforce the ordinance at issue. There is no indication the subject of the complaint knows the identities of some of the complainants. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the information we have marked identifies the complainants. Thus, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege.² However, the request for information reveals the subject of the complaint already knows the identity of the complainant in some of the remaining information. Further, you have failed to demonstrate the remaining basic information consists of the identifying information of an individual who reported a criminal violation to the department for purposes of the informer’s privilege. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining basic 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 is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. You assert the remaining basic information is protected by common-law privacy. Upon review, however, we find no portion of the remaining basic information is highly intimate

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining basic information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

In summary, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. In releasing basic information, the city may withhold the information we have 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,



Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/be

Ref: ID# 772327

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)