



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 3, 2019

Mr. Stephen D. Gates  
First Assistant City Attorney  
City Of Midland  
P.O. Box 1152  
Midland, Texas 79701

OR2019-14575

Dear Mr. Gates:

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# 768296 (City ID# M026105-031819).

The City of Midland (the "city"), received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You state you have released some information. You claim the submitted body worn camera recordings were not properly requested pursuant to section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes peace officers' body worn camera video recordings. Body worn cameras are subject to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. Chapter 1701 provides the procedures a requestor must follow when seeking a body worn camera recording. Section 1701.661(a) provides:

A member of the public is required to provide the following information when submitting a written request to a law enforcement agency for information recorded by a body worn camera:

- (1) the date and approximate time of the recording;

(2) the specific location where the recording occurred; and

(3) the name of one or more persons known to be a subject of the recording.

Occ. Code § 1701.661(a). In this instance, the requestor does not give the requisite information under section 1701.661(a). As the requestor did not properly request the body worn camera video recordings at issue pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released.<sup>1</sup> However, pursuant to section 1701.661(b), a “failure to provide all the information required by Subsection (a) to be part of a request for recorded information does not preclude the requestor from making a future request for the same recorded information.” *Id.* § 1701.661(b).

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 remaining information pertains to a criminal investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on this representation, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the remaining 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*, and includes, among other items, the identification and description of the complainant. *See* 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). Accordingly, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.<sup>2</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. This section encompasses the informer’s privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937

---

<sup>1</sup>As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

(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). 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 state the complainant reported a violation of law that carries criminal penalties to the city's police department. You also state there is no indication the subject of the report knows the identity of the informer. Thus, the city may withhold the informer's identity, which we marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

In summary, pursuant to section 1701.661 of the Occupations Code, as the requestor did not properly request the body worn camera video recordings at issue pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information, and the city need not release the submitted body camera video recordings in response to this request for information. With the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city may withhold the information we 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](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 "Pearlie Gault", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Pearlie Gault  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

PG/eb

Ref: ID#768296

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)