



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 24, 2022

Mr. Kevin Bailey
Assistant City Attorney
City of Midland
P.O. Box 1152
Midland, Texas 79701

OR2022-14940

Dear Mr. Bailey:

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# 949579 (Ref. Nos. #M036487-030222 and #M036856-040622).

The City of Midland (the "city") received two requests for information concerning specified incidents. You state you have released some information to the second requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the first requestor seeks only the police reports and pictures for specified dates. Thus, the body worn camera recordings submitted for the first request are not responsive. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the city is not required to release that information in response to the first request.

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. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses information protected by section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act], 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

[chapter 261 of the Family Code] 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 [chapter 261 of the Family Code] or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). You contend the information you indicated was used or developed in an investigation under chapter 261. Upon review, we find you have failed to establish this information consists of files, reports, records, communications, or working papers used or developed in an investigation under chapter 261. Further, we find you have not demonstrated the information at issue consists of a report of child abuse or neglect or was used or developed in an investigation under chapter 261. *See id.* § 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of Family Code ch. 261). Therefore, we conclude section 261.201 is not applicable to the information you indicated, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state the first request’s Exhibit B pertains to an open criminal investigation or prosecution. Based on this representation, we conclude the release of the information at issue would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the responsive information in the first request’s Exhibit B.

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 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). You state the first request’s Exhibit C and Exhibit D pertain to closed criminal investigations that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on this representation, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to first request’s Exhibit C and Exhibit D.

However, we note 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*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; 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* ORD 127 at 3-4. Thus, with the exception of the basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the responsive information in the first request's Exhibit B under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code and may withhold first request's Exhibit C and Exhibit D under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.¹

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 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 in Exhibit D identifies a complainant who reported violations of law to the city's police department. We have no indication the subject of the complaint is aware of the identity of the complainant in this instance. Based upon the city's representations and our review, we conclude the city has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to the information at issue. Therefore, the city may withhold the identity of the reporting party within the basic information in Exhibit D 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, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in the *Industrial Foundation* decision. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of

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

medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find the information we marked under common-law privacy satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in the *Industrial Foundation* decision. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked in the second request's Exhibit B under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy

In summary, with the exception of the basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the first request's Exhibit B under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code and may withhold first request's Exhibit C and Exhibit D under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. In releasing basic information, the city may withhold the identity of the reporting party within the basic information in Exhibit D under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. The city must withhold the information we marked in the second request's Exhibit B under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must release the remaining responsive 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,

Chase D. Young
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CDY/be

Ref: ID# 949579

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)