



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 5, 2022

Ms. Kimberly G. Kelley  
Counsel for the City of Lakeway  
Bickerstaff, Heath, Delgado & Acosta, L.L.P.  
3711 South MoPac Expressway, Building One, Suite 300  
Austin, Texas 78746

OR2022-09897

Dear Ms. Kelley:

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# 938363.

The City of Lakeway (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for code compliance complaints pertaining to a specified location during a defined period of time. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim 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. This section 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); *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).

You state some of the submitted information reveals the identity of one or more complainants who reported possible violations of city ordinances that carry civil penalties to city personnel and city code compliance officers. You indicate the subject of the complaint does not know the identity of the complainants. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude you have demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer’s privilege to some of the information at issue, which we marked. Therefore, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information consists of the identifying information of an individual for purposes of the informer’s privilege. Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of the informer’s privilege to the remaining information, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c).<sup>1</sup> *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue does not appear to be the type specifically excluded by subsection (c). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the personal e-mail address we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege. The city must withhold the personal e-mail address we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure. The city must release the remaining information.

---

<sup>1</sup> 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).

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,

Jahna Ward  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JW/jxd

Ref: ID# 938363

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)