



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 20, 2020

Mr. Stephen D. Gates
Frist Assistant City Attorney
City of Midland
P.O. Box 1152
Midland, Texas 79701

OR2020-11345

Dear Mr. Gates:

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# 827005 (Reference Nos. #M029386-021820; #M029387-021820; #M029408-021920).

The City of Midland (the "city") received three requests from two requestors for information pertaining to a specified investigation. You claim some of the submitted information was not properly requested pursuant to section 1701.661 of the Occupations Code. You also claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information 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 (Tex. 1977). You state the submitted information relates to a pending criminal investigation and prosecution, and release of the information would interfere with the investigation and prosecution of the case. Based upon this representation, we conclude the release of the submitted 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 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the submitted information.

However, 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). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. See 531 S.W.2d at 186-187; see also Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Accordingly, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.¹

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 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 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.

You state the information at issue identifies a complainant who reported violations of criminal law to the city’s police department. You state there is no indication the subject of the report knows the identity of the complainant. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude you have demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer’s privilege to some of the information, which we marked. Therefore, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege. However, we find none of the remaining information at issue identifies an individual who reported a criminal violation to the city for purposes of the informer’s privilege. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining basic information under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of

¹ As we are able to make this determination, we do not address the applicability of section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code to the submitted body worn camera video recording. See generally Occ. Code § 1701.661(a), (e). Further, as our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. You assert some of the remaining information is protected by common-law privacy. Upon review, however, we find no portion of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining basic information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

In summary, 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. In releasing the basic information, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law 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.

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,

Kieran Hillis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KH/rm

Ref: ID# 827005

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)