



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 31, 2020

Ms. Alicia K. Kreh
Counsel for the City of Weatherford
Taylor, Olson, Adkins, Sralla & Elam, L. L. P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2020-03068

Dear Ms. Kreh:

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# 816686 (Ref. No. W001769-121919).

The City of Weatherford (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for a specified incident report. You state you will withhold motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ You further state you will withhold certain information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).² You claim some of the requested information is not subject to release pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. You further claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

¹ 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). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b).

² Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

Initially, you state some of the requested information includes body worn camera recordings of city police department officers. 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 the following:

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). The requestor does not give the requisite information under section 1701.661(a). As the requestor did not properly request the body worn camera recordings at issue pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach these recordings and the city is not required to release them.³ 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) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706, 710 (Tex. 1977). You state the submitted information relates to a pending criminal investigation or prosecution. Based on this representation, we conclude the release of this information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177, 186-87 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (delineating law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976)

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). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public

³ As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your remaining arguments to withhold this information.

by *Houston Chronicle*). We note basic information includes a detailed description of the offense and the identity of the complainant. See ORD 127 at 3-4. Thus, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.⁴

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. *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). 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). 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. You state the basic information contains the identifying information of a complainant who reported possible criminal activities to the city’s police department. We have no indication the subject of the complaint knows the identity of the complainant. Upon review, we conclude the city may withhold the basic information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer’s privilege.

In summary, because the requestor did not properly request the requested body worn camera recordings pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach the body worn camera recordings at issue and the city is not required to release them. With the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. However, in releasing basic information, the city may withhold the basic information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the 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.

⁴ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments to withhold this information.

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 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 stylized with a large, sweeping initial "T" and a cursive "Neal".

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/jxd

Ref: ID# 816686

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)