



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 1, 2020

Mr. Nicholas Toulet  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Midland  
P.O. Box 1152  
Midland, Texas 79702-1152

OR2020-09935

Dear Mr. Toulet:

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# 819558 (ORR# M029027-011420).

The City of Midland (the "city") received a request for records pertaining to welfare checks involving named individuals. 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 protected by other statutes. Section 261.201 of the Family Code provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working

papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

...

(k) Notwithstanding Subsection (a), an investigating agency, other than the [Texas Department of Family and Protective Services] or the Texas Juvenile Justice Department, on request, shall provide to the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child who is the subject of reported abuse or neglect, or to the child if the child is at least 18 years of age, information concerning the reported abuse or neglect that would otherwise be confidential under this section. The investigating agency shall withhold information under this subsection if the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of the child requesting the information is alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a), (k). Some of the submitted information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect conducted by the city. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of chapter 261 of the Family Code). Accordingly, we find this information is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. In this instance, the requestor is a parent of the child victims listed in the information at issue. However, we note the requestor is alleged to have committed the suspected abuse or neglect. Thus, the requestor does not have a right of access to the information at issue under section 261.201(k). *See id.* § 261.201(k). Therefore, the city must withhold report numbers 1907-00641 and MP190607007 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.<sup>1</sup> *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute). However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information involves a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect of a child made under chapter 261 or how the information was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law informer’s privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 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. *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

---

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

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.

Although the city asserts the remaining information is protected under the common-law informer’s privilege, we note the identity of the informant is known to the subject of the complaint. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege.

In summary, the city must withhold report numbers 1907-00641 and MP190607007 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. The city 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,

Katie Stallcup  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

AKS/mo

---

<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) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person’s agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Thus, if the city receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a decision from this office.

Mr. Nicholas Toulet - Page 4

Ref: ID# 819558

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)