



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 18, 2022

Ms. Savannah L. Koehler  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of New Braunfels  
550 Landa Street  
New Braunfels, Texas 78130

OR2022-31931

Dear Ms. Koehler:

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# 978490 (ORR# C1020).

The City of New Braunfels (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. The city claims 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 (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). However, 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* Open Records Decision No. 208 (1978). The submitted documents reveal the subject of the complaints knows the identity of the complainant at issue. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 on the basis of the informer's privilege. *See id.*

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 826.0211(a) of the Health and Safety Code, which reads as follows:

(a) Information contained in a rabies vaccination certificate or in any record compiled from the information contained in one or more certificates that identifies or tends to identify an owner or an address, telephone number, or other personally identifying information of an owner of a vaccinated animal is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act]. The information contained in the certificate or record may not include the social security number or the driver's license number of the owner of the vaccinated animal.

Health & Safety Code § 826.0211(a). Section 826.0211 is applicable only to information contained in a rabies vaccination certificate or in a record compiled from information contained in one or more rabies vaccination certificates. Upon review, we find section 826.0211 is applicable to some of the information at issue, which we have marked. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 826.0211(a) of the Health and Safety Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. The Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). The city must withhold the date of birth it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release.<sup>1</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. The city must withhold the driver's license number it has marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

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

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 at 2 (1987), 480 at 5 (1987).

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). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The remaining information contains an e-mail address of a member of the public that does not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c), and the city does not inform us a member of the public has affirmatively consented to its release. Therefore, the city must withhold the e-mail address it has marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the following: (1) the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 826.0211(a) of the Health and Safety Code; (2) the date of birth it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; (3) the driver’s license number it has marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code; and (4) the e-mail address it has marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining 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/mo

Ref: ID# 978490

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)