



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 14, 2020

Ms. Judith N. Benton
Assistant City Attorney
City of Waco
P. O. Box 2570
Waco, Texas 76702-2570

OR2020-31220

Dear Ms. Benton:

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# 858089 (ORR# 20-077).

The City of Waco (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exception and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See Gov't Code § 552.304* (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note the submitted information includes a body worn camera recording of a city police officer. 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 the following:

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). The requestor does not give the requisite information under section 1701.661(a). As the requestor did not properly request the body worn camera recording at issue pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and the city is not required to release it.¹ 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).

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 exception 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 the submitted 9-1-1 call recordings contains the identifying information of a complainant who reported possible criminal activities to the city. We note in some circumstances, where an oral statement is captured on tape and the voice of the informant is recognizable, it may be necessary to withhold the entire audio statement to protect the informant’s identity. Open Records Decision No. 434 at 2 (1986). Upon review, we conclude the city may withhold the submitted 9-1-1 call recordings in their entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer’s privilege.

In summary, because the requestor did not properly request the submitted body worn camera recording pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach the body worn camera recording at issue and the city is not required to release it. The city may withhold the submitted 9-1-1 call recordings in their entirety under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer’s privilege.

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address the arguments of the city to withhold this 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/mo

Ref: ID# 858089

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)