



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 26, 2020

Ms. Allison A. Bastian-Rodriguez  
Counsel for the City of Harlingen  
Denton Navarro Rocha Bernal Hyde & Zech, P.C.  
701 East Harrison, Suite 100  
Harlingen, Texas 78550-9165

OR2020-14548

Dear Ms. Bastian-Rodriguez:

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# 829014.

The City of Harlingen (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for all open warrants and arrest records for a certain time period. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes court-filed documents. Section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code provides for required public disclosure of "information that is also contained in a public court record," unless the information is made confidential under the Act or other law. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). Although you seek to withhold this information under section 552.108 of the Government Code, this section is a discretionary exception and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.108 subject to waiver). As such, section 552.108 does not make information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the court-filed documents, which we marked, under section 552.108. Additionally, we note common-law privacy is not applicable to information contained in public court records. *See Star-Telegram v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54 (Tex. 1992). Therefore, no portion of the court-filed documents may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, because section

552.130 of the Government Code makes information confidential for purposes of section 552.022, we will address its applicability to the court-filed documents subject to section 552.022(a)(17). Further, we will address your arguments against disclosure of the remaining information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public 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 section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in 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.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). Some of the submitted information was used or developed in investigations of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect conducted by the city’s police department. *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. You do not indicate the city has adopted a rule that governs the release of this type of information and therefore we assume no such regulation exists. Given that assumption, we conclude the city must withhold the information we marked 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). We note the city must not release basic information when a report is confidential under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.

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[.]”<sup>2</sup> Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, a

---

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

<sup>2</sup> Although you cite section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code in your brief, based on your arguments, we understand you to raise section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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 information at issue relates to pending criminal prosecutions, and release of the information would interfere with the investigation and prosecution of the cases. Generally, the release of information pertaining to an open case is presumed to interfere with the criminal investigation. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases). We note, however, the information at issue includes a DIC-24 Statutory Warning and a DIC-25 Notice of Suspension. The Statutory Warning and Notice of Suspension have previously been provided to the arrestee. Because copies of these documents have previously been released to the arrestee, we find you have not shown release of these documents will interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime, and these documents may not be withheld under section 552.108(a)(1). *See Gov't Code* § 552.108(a)(1). Because the remaining information at issue has not been previously released, we conclude release of this information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. Thus, we find section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the remaining information at issue.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure “basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.” *Id.* § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic “front-page” 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 basic information). We note basic information includes, among other items, the identity of the complainant, but not the identity of the victim unless the victim is the complainant, and does not include dates of birth or motor vehicle record information subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code. *See* ORD 127 at 3-4. Accordingly, with the exception of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code, Statutory Warning, Notice of Suspension, and basic information, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

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 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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). The court of appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected

---

<sup>3</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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.). Therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked in the basic information and the public citizen's date of birth within the Statutory Warning and Notice of Suspension under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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, 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, 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)*. Additionally, the privilege is not intended to protect the identities of public officials and employees who have a duty to report violations of the law. Because a public employee acts within the scope of his employment when filing a complaint, the informer's privilege does not protect the public employee's identity. *Cf. United States v. St. Regis Paper Co.*, 328 F. Supp. 660, 665 (W.D. Wis. 1971) (concluding public officer may not claim informer's reward for service it is his or her official duty to perform).

You claim some of the basic information identifies complainants who reported violations of criminal law to the city. You state the subjects of the complaints do not know the identities of the complainants. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude you demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to most of the information at issue. Accordingly, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city may withhold the identifying information of the reporting parties in the basic information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. However, we find you have failed to establish the applicability of the informer's privilege to the remaining information at issue. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

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. *See Gov't Code § 552.130*. Accordingly, the city must

withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. With the exception of: (1) the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code, (2) the Statutory Warning, (3) the Notice of Suspension, and (4) the basic information, which must all be released, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked in the basic information and the public citizen's date of birth within the Statutory Warning and Notice of Suspension under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. With the exception of the information we marked for release, the city may withhold the identifying information of the reporting parties in the basic information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. In releasing the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17), the Statutory Warning, and the Notice of Suspension, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

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,

Deborah Southerland  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

DS/jlbm

Ref: ID# 829014

c: Requestor