



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 28, 2020

Mr. Jonathan T. Koury  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Bryan  
P.O. Box 1000  
Bryan, Texas 77805

OR2020-06446

Dear Mr. Koury:

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# 814189.

The City of Bryan (the "city") received a request for all information involving two specified addresses during a specified time period. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. 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. This section encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, such as section 58.008 of the Family Code, which provides, in part:

(b) Except as provided by Subsection (c), law enforcement records concerning a child and information concerning a child that are stored by electronic means or otherwise from which a record could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

- (1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult records;
- (2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as adult records, accessible only under controls that are separate and distinct from the controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and

(3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subsection (c) or Subchapter B, D, or E.

Fam. Code § 58.008(b); *see also id.* § 51.03(a)-(b) (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). Section 58.008(b) is applicable to records of juvenile conduct that occurred before, on, or after September 1, 2017. *See* Act of May 28, 2017, 85th Leg., R.S., ch. 746, § 22. The juvenile must have been at least 10 years old and less than 17 years of age when the conduct occurred. *See* Fam. Code § 51.02(2) (defining “child” for purposes of title 3 of Family Code). Upon review, we agree Exhibit B involves a juvenile offender, so as to fall within the scope of section 58.008(b). It does not appear that any of the exceptions in section 58.008 apply. Accordingly, the city must withhold Exhibit B under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(b) of the Family Code.<sup>1</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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). However, 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* Open Records Decision No. 208 (1978).

You state the remaining information identifies complainants who reported possible violations of Chapter 130 of the city’s Code of Ordinances. We understand a violation of the relevant city ordinances carries civil or criminal penalties. Upon review, we conclude you have demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer’s privilege to some of the information at issue, which we have marked. Therefore, 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. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue identifies a complainant for purposes of the informer’s privilege. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976).

---

<sup>1</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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 Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See 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.). We note the requestor has a right of access to her own date of birth pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code, and this information may not be withheld from her under common-law privacy. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). In addition, we note some of the individuals whose dates of birth are at issue have been de-identified pursuant to the common-law informer's privilege. Therefore, the privacy interests in their dates of birth are sufficiently protected, and the city may not withhold them under common-law privacy. Nevertheless, the city must withhold the dates of birth belonging to identifiable individuals other than the requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release.<sup>2</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. We note, because section 552.130 protects privacy interests, the requestor has a right of access to her own motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city: (1) must withhold Exhibit B under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.008(b) of the Family Code; (2) may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege; (3) must withhold the dates of birth belonging to identifiable individuals other than the requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (4) must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code; and (5) must release the remaining information to this requestor.<sup>3</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.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481, 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

<sup>3</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. We note 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). Furthermore, we note Open Records Letter No. 2017-07737 is a previous determination issued to the city authorizing it to withhold the dates of birth of public citizens under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without requesting a decision from this office.

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', written in a cursive style.

Tim Neal  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TN/rm

Ref: ID# 814189

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)