



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 27, 2020

Ms. Lindsey K. Rattikin  
Assistant University Counsel  
Southern Methodist University  
P.O. Box 750132  
Dallas, Texas 75275-0132

OR2020-06294

Dear Ms. Rattikin:

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# 821272.

The Southern Methodist University Police Department (the "department") received a request for the police report pertaining to a specified incident. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.147 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the department has redacted portions of the submitted information. You do not assert, nor does our review of the records indicate, you have been authorized to withhold this information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). Therefore, information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether the information comes within the scope of an exception to disclosure. In this instance, we can discern the nature of the redacted information; thus, being deprived of this information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. In the future, however, the department should refrain from redacting any information that it is not authorized to withhold in seeking an open records ruling. Failure to do so may result in the presumption the redacted information is public. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302.

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." *Id.* § 552.101. This exception encompasses the informer's privilege, which has

---

<sup>1</sup> Although you do not raise section 552.147 of the Government Code in your brief, we understand you to assert this exception based on the substance of your argument.

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 indicate the information you have marked reveals the identity of a complainant who reported a possible violation of state law that carries a criminal penalty to the department, who is authorized to enforce the law at issue. There is no indication the subject of the complaint knows the identity of the complainant. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the information we have marked identifies the complainant. Thus, the department may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. However, you have failed to demonstrate the remainder of the 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 department may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

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. Section 552.101 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 court of appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *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.). Additionally, we note the phone numbers of members of the public are generally not highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 551 at 3 (1990) (disclosure of person's name, address, or telephone number not an invasion of privacy), 455 at 7 (1987) (home addresses and telephone numbers not protected under privacy). We note the requestor has a right of access to his own date of birth. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) ("person or a person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests"); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning herself). Thus, with the exception of the requestor's date of birth, the department must withhold the remaining date of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.147 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the social security number of a living person. Gov't Code § 552.147. We note the requestor has a right of access to his own social security number. *See generally id.* § 552.023(b) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates, or that person's representative, solely on grounds that information is considered confidential by privacy principles). Therefore, the department may not withhold the social security number at issue from the requestor.

In summary, the department may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. with the exception of the requestor's date of birth, the department must withhold the remaining date of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must release the remaining information.<sup>2</sup>

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 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,



Meredith L. Coffman  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MLC/jxd

Ref: ID# 821272

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>2</sup> We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Thus, the department must again seek a decision from this office if it receives another request for the same information from another requestor.