



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 25, 2019

Ms. Cindy Hall
Open Records Coordinator
Dallas Animal Services
1818 North Westmoreland Road
Dallas, Texas 75212

OR2019-26914

Dear Ms. Cindy Hall:

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# 787512 (Ref. No. C006311-070919).

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for information related to specified animals. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exception you claim 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. 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

¹ You also claim the informer's privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 508. The Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022 of the Government Code. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001); *see also* Gov't Code § 552.022(a). In this instance, section 552.022 is not applicable to the information you seek to withhold under the informer's privilege and, therefore, we do not address your argument under rule 508.

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, 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, individuals 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).

You assert the information you have marked reveals the identities of complainants who reported possible violations of the Dallas City Code using the city's 3-1-1 system. You inform us the 3-1-1 system routes the reports of alleged violations to the proper law enforcement entities, including the city's police and code enforcement departments. You explain violations of the city codes at issue are misdemeanors punishable by a fine. There is no indication the subject of the complaints knows the identity of the complainants. Based on your representation and our review, we conclude, except for 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. See Open Records Decision No. 156 (1977) (name of person who makes complaint about another individual to city's animal control division is excepted from disclosure by informer's privilege so long as information furnished discloses potential violation of state law). However, we find the remaining information you have marked, which we have marked for release, does not identify an informer for the purposes of the informer's privilege. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the information we have marked for release under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable

Ms. Cindy Hall - Page 3

charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tim Neal". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Tim" being more prominent than the last name "Neal".

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/gw

Ref: ID# 787512

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)