



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 30, 2022

Ms. Shawnta A. Adams
Assistant City Attorney
Arlington Police Department
P.O. Box 1065
Mail Stop 04-0200
Arlington, Texas 76004-1065

OR2022-36975

Dear Ms. Adams:

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# 988276 (Reference No. R140135).

The Arlington Police Department (the "department") received a request for a 9-1-1 audio recording pertaining to a specified incident.¹ You claim 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.

Initially, we note the requestor only seeks a 9-1-1 audio recording pertaining to a specified incident. The department has submitted information beyond the specified 9-1-1 audio recording. Accordingly, the portions of the submitted information that do not consist of the information requested are not responsive to the present request. This ruling does not

¹ You state the department sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.2d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (if governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or over-broad request, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified).

address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the department is not required to release such information in response to this request.²

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).

The department states the responsive information contains the identifying information of a complainant who reported possible criminal activities to the department. We note, in some circumstances, where an oral statement is captured on tape and the voice of the informant is recognizable, it may be necessary to withhold the entire audio statement to protect the informant’s identity. Open Records Decision No. 434 at 2 (1986). Upon review, we conclude the department has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer’s privilege to the information at issue. Therefore, the department may withhold the responsive information 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

² As we are able to make this determination, we need not address the submitted argument against disclosure of this information.

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,

Kimbell Kesling
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KK/pt

Ref: ID# 988276

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)