



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 24, 2022

Mr. Ryan Brooke
Assistant City Attorney
City of Lubbock
P.O. Box 2000
Lubbock, Texas 79457

OR2022-05607

Dear Mr. Brooke:

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# 933195 (ORR# P002110).

The City of Lubbock (the "city") received a request for incident number 21-30418. The city claims some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.1175, 552.136, and 552.147 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions the city claims 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." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 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. *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)*. 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. 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).

The city states portions of the submitted information identify a complainant who reported violations of law to the city. Upon review, however, we note the individual at issue is a peace officer. Thus, we conclude the city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to the information at issue. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

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 common-law right of 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 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.). Thus, with the exception of the requestor's date of birth, to which the requestor has a right of access pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) ("person's authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests"); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning herself).

The city argues some of the remaining information subject to section 552.1175 of the Government Code. Section 552.1175 provides in part:

(a) This section applies only to:

(1) current or honorably retired peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure[.]

(b) Information that relates to the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, or social security number of an individual to whom this section applies, or that reveals whether the individual has family members is confidential and may not be disclosed to the public under this chapter if the individual to whom the information relates:

- (1) chooses to restrict public access to the information; and
- (2) notifies the governmental body of the individual's choice on a form provided by the governmental body, accompanied by evidence of the individual's status.

Gov't Code § 552.1175(a)(1), (b). Some of the remaining information relates to an individual who is licensed as a peace officer of another law enforcement agency. Accordingly, if the information we marked and noted relates to a peace officer who elects to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), then the city must withhold the information we marked and noted under section 552.1175 of the Government Code. *Cf.* Act of June 7, 2021, 87th Leg., R.S., S.B. 1134, § 9 (to be codified at Gov't Code § 552.117(c)) (providing "family member" has meaning assigned by Fin. Code § 31.006(d)). Conversely, if the individual whose information is at issue does not elect to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), then the information we marked and noted may not be withheld under section 552.1175.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, "Notwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Accordingly, the city must withhold the credit card numbers we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Section 552.147(a) of the Government Code excepts the social security number of a living individual from public disclosure. Gov't Code § 552.147(a). Accordingly, the city may withhold the social security numbers within the remaining information under section 552.147 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of the requestor's date of birth, the city must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. If the information we marked and noted relates to a peace officer who elects to restrict access to the information in accordance with section 552.1175(b), then the city must withhold the information we marked and noted under section 552.1175 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the credit card numbers we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the social security numbers within the remaining information under section 552.147 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information to this requestor.¹

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.

¹ We note the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Thus, if the city receives another request for the same information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a decision from this office.

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,

Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/be

Ref: ID# 933195

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)