



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 19, 2020

Ms. Alicia Kreh
Counsel for the City of Flower Mound
Taylor, Olson, Adkins, Sralla & Elam, L. L. P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2020-20814

Dear Ms. Kreh:

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# 841131.

The Town of Flower Mound (the "town"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident and a named individual.¹ You state the town will redact information pursuant to sections 552.130(c) and 552.147(b) of the Government Code and Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).² You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. You also state you notified the Double Oaks Police Department ("Double Oaks"), Farmers Branch Police Department ("Farmers Branch"), and the Plano Police Department

¹ The town states it sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

² Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact the social security number of a living person without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act. *See id.* § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

(“Plano”).³ *See* Gov’t Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit written comments regarding why information should or should not be released). We have received comments from Double Oaks and Farmers Branch. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes police officers’ body worn camera recordings. Body worn cameras are subject to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. Chapter 1701 provides the procedures a requestor must follow when seeking a body worn camera recording. Section 1701.661(a) provides:

A member of the public is required to provide the following information when submitting a written request to a law enforcement agency for information recorded by a body worn camera:

- (1) the date and approximate time of the recording;
- (2) the specific location where the recording occurred; and
- (3) the name of one or more persons known to be a subject of the recording.

Occ. Code § 1701.661(a). In this instance, the requestor does not give the requisite information under section 1701.661(a). As the requestor did not properly request the body worn camera recordings at issue pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released. However, pursuant to section 1701.661(b), a “failure to provide all the information required by Subsection (a) to be part of a request for recorded information does not preclude the requestor from making a future request for the same recorded information.” *Id.* § 1701.661(b).

Next, we note the submitted information contains a court-filed document. 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 the town seeks 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 town may not withhold the court-filed document, which we marked, under section 552.108. As you raise no other exceptions to disclosure of the marked court-filed document, it must be released pursuant to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. However, we will address your arguments against disclosure of the remaining information.

³ As of the date of this letter, we have not received any comments Plano explaining why any portion of the submitted information should not be released to the requestor.

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 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 that release of the remaining information will interfere with a pending criminal case. Based upon your representations, we conclude that the release of the remaining 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).

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). We note basic information includes a detailed description of the offense, but does not include dates of birth, information related to victims or witnesses who are not the complainant, or the complainant’s home address or telephone number, unless the address is the location of the crime or premises involved. *See* ORD 127 at 3-4. Accordingly, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the town may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.⁴

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 department raises 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). 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

⁴ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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.

The town states portions of the basic information identify a complainant who reported violations of law to the police department. Based upon the town's representations and our review, we conclude the town has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to the information at issue. Therefore, the town may withhold the identity of the complainant under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

In summary, the submitted body worn camera recordings at issue were not properly requested pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code and need not be released to this requestor in response to this request for information. With the exception of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code and basic information, the town may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. In releasing the basic information, the town may withhold the identity of the complainant 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,

Paige Lay
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PL/rm

Ref: ID# 841131

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party
(w/o enclosures)