



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 12, 2020

Mr. L. Brian Narvaez
Counsel for the City of McKinney
Brown & Hoffmeister, L. L. P.
740 East Campbell Road, Suite 800
Richardson, Texas 75081

OR2020-20416A

Dear Mr. Narvaez:

This office issued Open Records Letter No. 2020-20416 (2020) on August 14, 2020. We have determined the prior ruling should be corrected. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.306, .352. Accordingly, we hereby withdraw the prior ruling. This decision is substituted for Open Records Letter No. 2020-20416 and serves as the correct ruling. *See generally id.* § 552.011 (Office of Attorney General may issue decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code). This ruling was assigned ID# 853473 (ORR# 2020-411, 2020-412).

The City of Prosper (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to two named individuals and specified address. The city claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions 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." *Id.* § 552.101. This section encompasses section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part, as follows:

- (a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act], 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). Upon review, we find Exhibit B was used or developed in an investigation of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect under chapter 261 of the Family Code. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of section 261.201), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of section 261.201). Thus, this information is within the scope of section 261.201(a). Although the city informs us the requestor represents a parent of the child victim, that parent was suspected of committing the alleged or suspected abuse. Therefore, we determine the requestor does not have a right of access to this information under section 261.201(k). *See id.* § 261.201(k). Accordingly, the city must withhold Exhibit B under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code.¹ *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

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.

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address the other argument of the city to withhold this information.

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 the information it has marked in Exhibit C consists of the identifying information of complainants who reported possible criminal activities to a law enforcement agency. Upon review, we conclude the city may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer's privilege.

In summary, the city must withhold Exhibit B under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201(a) of the Family Code. The city may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer's privilege. 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 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/eb

Ref: ID# 853473

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)