



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 16, 2020

Ms. Marcialyn Hooper
Open Records Coordinator
Dallas Animal Services
1818 North Westmoreland Road
Dallas, Texas 75212

OR2020-31595

Dear Ms. Hooper:

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# 858787 (ORR# C006814-092320).

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for all information involving the city's Department of Animal Services and a specified address. You state you will release some information to the requestor. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

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

¹ We note the city also claims the informer's privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 508. The Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are "other law" within the meaning of section 552.022 of the Government Code. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001); *see also* Gov't Code §552.022(a). Section 552.022 is not applicable to the submitted information and, therefore, we do not address the city's argument under rule 508.

² We assume the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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, individuals who provide information in the course of an investigation 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). 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 state the submitted complaint information reveals the identity of an individual who reported a violation of section 7-4.14 of the city code. You state that the violation is a civil offense punishable by fine. You do not indicate, nor does it appear, the subject of the complaint knows the identity of the reporting party. Based upon these 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, which we have marked. Therefore, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.³ *See* Open Records Decision No. 156 (1977) (name of person who makes complaint about another individual to city's animal control division is excepted from disclosure by informer's privilege so long as information furnished discloses potential violation of state law). However, you have failed to demonstrate the remainder of the information at issue consists of the identifying information of an individual who made a report of a criminal violation to the city for purposes of the informer's privilege. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

You also claim the remaining information at issue is protected by section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the judicial decision in *Scher v. United States*, 305 U.S. 251 (1938). However, this case does not determine the confidentiality of any information for purposes of the Act. Therefore, we find none of the information at issue may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with *Scher v. United States*.

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 doctrine of common-law 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

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

Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See 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.). However, we note one of the dates of birth at issue belongs to an individual who has been de-identified and whose privacy interests are, thus, adequately protected. Therefore, the date of birth belonging to an individual who has been de-identified may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. Accordingly, the city must withhold the identifiable public citizen's date of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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.⁴ *See Gov't Code* § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city: (1) may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege; (2) must withhold the identifiable public citizen's date of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (3) must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code; and (4) 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,

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/gw

⁴ The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Ms. Marcialyn Hooper - Page 4

Ref: ID# 858787

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)