



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 11, 2022

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

OR2022-07455

Dear Mr. Narvaez:

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# 935333 (ID No. P021473).

The City of McKinney (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for records related to specified addresses during a particular time period. You state the city has released some information. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 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 public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in part, as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, 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.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). You state Exhibit B was used or developed in an investigation of alleged 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 of Family Code). You state the city has not adopted any rules that would permit the release of the information at issue. Accordingly, we find this information is subject to chapter 261 of the Family Code. Therefore, the city must withhold Exhibit B under section 552.101 of the Government Code pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code.¹ *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). The city states the remaining information relates to a closed criminal investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on these representations and our review, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the remaining information.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. *Id.* § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). *See also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). We note basic information includes, among other items, the identity of the complainant. *See id.* at 3-4. Thus, with the exception of the basic information, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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

¹ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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. The city states the basic information it marked under the informer's privilege consists of the identifying information of a complainant who reported possible criminal activities to the city's police department. Upon review, we conclude the city may withhold the information it 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 pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code. With the exception of the basic information, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. In releasing the basic information, the city may withhold the information it marked 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,

Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/mo

Ref: ID# 935333

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)