



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 28, 2020

Ms. Marcialyn Hooper  
Open Records Coordinator  
Dallas Animal Services  
1818 North Westmoreland Road  
Dallas, Texas 75212

OR2020-11927

Dear Ms. Hooper:

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# 825624 (ORR# C01631).

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for a specified animal-quarantine report. The city states it has released some of the requested information, but claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the claimed exception 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. The city claims the information it has marked is protected by the informer's privilege pursuant to judicial decision and cites to *Scher v. United States*, 305 U.S. 251 (1938). However, we find this case does not determine the confidentiality of any

---

<sup>1</sup> We note the city also claims the informer's privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 508. The Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022 of the Government Code. See *In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001); see also Gov't Code § 552.022(a). Section 552.022 is not applicable to the information the city seeks to withhold under the informer's privilege and, therefore, we do not address the city's argument under rule 508.

information for purposes of the Act. Therefore, none of the information at issue may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with *Scher v. United States*.

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). 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).

The city states portions of the submitted information identify complainants who reported violations of its Code of Ordinances to its Code Enforcement officers, who are responsible for enforcing the ordinances at issue. The city also explains violations of the city ordinances at issue are punishable by fine. Upon review, we conclude the city has 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 the city has 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. Accordingly, the city must release the remaining information.

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

Ms. Marcialyn Hooper - Page 3

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,

James L. Coggeshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLC/mo

Ref: ID# 825624

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)