



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 11, 2020

Ms. Captoria Brown  
Paralegal  
City of Carrollton  
P.O. Box 110535  
Carrollton, Texas 75011-0535

OR2020-13210

Dear Mr. Brown:

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# 832018 (Reference No. 19377).

The City of Carrollton (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You state the city released some of the requested information. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108(a)(1) 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 . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]" Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information at issue. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state the information you marked relates to a pending criminal investigation. Based upon your representation and our review, we find release of the information at issue 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, the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup>

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. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with 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). 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 contend portions of the remaining information reveal the identity of an informer who reported possible criminal violations of law to the city. We have no indication the subject of the report knows the informer’s identity. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude the city has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer’s privilege to some of the information at issue. Therefore, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege. However, you have not demonstrated the remaining information at issue identifies an individual who reported a criminal or city ordinance violation to the city for purposes of the informer’s privilege. Accordingly, 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). 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.). We note the remaining date of birth you marked belongs to an individual who is de-identified and whose privacy interests are thus protected. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the

---

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

remaining date of birth you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. With the exception of the information we marked for release, the city may withhold the information you marked in under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. 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,

Jahna Ward  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JW/mo

Ref: ID# 832018

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>2</sup> We note the information being released in this instance includes the requestor's motor vehicle record information to which the requestor has a right of access under section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates, or that party's representative, solely on grounds 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).