



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 21, 2022

Mr. Joseph J. Gorfida
Counsel for the City of Richardson
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, L.L.P.
500 North Akard Street, Suite 1800
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2022-17688

Dear Mr. Gorfida:

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# 954901 (Reference No. 129055).

The City of Richardson (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You state the city released some of the requested information. 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.

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 that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information at issue. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state the submitted information relates to a pending criminal investigation. Based upon your representation and our review, we find 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 submitted information.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. See 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; see also Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). We note basic information includes the identity of the complainant. See ORD 127 at 3-4. Thus, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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 information protected by the common-law informer's privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. 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 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. Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1-2 (1978). The 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 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 (1990), 515 at 4-5. 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 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. 600, 665 (W.D. Wis. 1971) (concluding public officer may not claim informer's reward for service if it is his or her official duty to perform).

You state some of the basic information identifies a complainant who reported possible violations of section 5-10 of the city's Code of Ordinances to the city's Animal Services Department (the “department”). We understand the department is responsible for enforcing the relevant portions of the city codes. You also state a violation of the relevant city ordinances is punishable by a fine. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude the city has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to some of the information at issue. Thus, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. However, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the information we marked for release identifies a complainant for purposes of the informer's privilege. Therefore, the

city may not withhold any of the information we marked for release under section 552.101 on that basis.

In summary, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. In releasing basic information, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city may withhold the information you 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,

Jahna Ward
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JW/jm

Ref: ID# 954901

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)