



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 20, 2022

Mr. Justin Smith  
Records Manager  
Records Division  
North Richland Hills Police Department  
P.O. Box 820609  
North Richland Hills, Texas 76182-0609

OR2022-14523

Dear Mr. Smith:

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# 949080 (ORR# W009513).

The North Richland Hills Police Department (the "department") received a request for a specified incident report. The department indicates it is withholding some of the requested information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code and Open Records Letter No. 2021-09607 (2021).<sup>1</sup> The department claims some of 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.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. See Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor pursuant to section 552.130(e). See *id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Open Records Letter No. 2021-09607 authorizes the department to withhold dates of birth of members of the public under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without the necessity of requesting an attorney general's decision. See *id.* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 at 7-8 (2001).

(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). 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) (public officer may not claim informer's reward for service it is public officer's official duty to perform). Upon review, we find the department has failed to establish the informer's privilege is applicable to any of the information at issue. Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 on that ground.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law physical safety exception that the Texas Supreme Court recognized in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Cox Texas Newspapers, L.P. & Hearst Newspapers, L.L.C.*, 343 S.W.3d 112, 117 (Tex. 2011) ("freedom from physical harm is an independent interest protected under law, untethered to the right of privacy"). In the *Cox* decision, the Supreme Court recognized, for the first time, a common-law physical safety exception to required disclosure. *Cox*, 343 S.W.3d at 118. Pursuant to this common-law physical safety exception, the court determined "information may be withheld [from public release] if disclosure would create a substantial threat of physical harm." *Id.* In applying this new standard, the court noted "deference must be afforded" law enforcement experts regarding the probability of harm, but further cautioned "vague assertions of risk will not carry the day." *Id.* at 119. Upon review, we find the department has failed to establish release of any of the submitted information would subject an individual to a substantial risk of physical harm. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law physical safety exception. Therefore, the department must release the submitted 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/jm

Ref: ID# 949080

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)