



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 19, 2022

Mr. Ariel San Miguel
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2022-39324

Dear Mr. Miguel:

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# 991002 (Reference No. D001458).

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. 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.

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 section 826.0311 of the Health and Safety Code, which states, in part, the following:

- (a) Information that is contained in a municipal or county registry of dogs and cats under Section 826.031 that identifies or tends to identify the owner or an address, telephone number, or other personally identifying information of the owner of the registered dog or cat is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act]. The information contained in the registry may not include the social security number or the driver's license number of the owner of the registered animal.
- (b) The information may be disclosed only to a governmental entity or a person that, under a contract with a governmental entity, provides animal control services or animal registration services for the governmental entity

for purposes related to the protection of public health and safety. A governmental entity or person that receives the information must maintain the confidentiality of the information, may not disclose the information under [the Act], and may not use the information for a purpose that does not directly relate to the protection of public health and safety.

Health & Safety Code § 826.0311(a), (b). Section 826.0311 applies only to the actual pet registry; it does not apply to the contents of other records, even though those documents may contain the same information as the pet registry. *See* Open Records Decision No. 658 at 4 (1998) (statutory confidentiality provision must be express, and confidentiality requirement will not be implied from statutory structure). The city states the submitted information contains the information of the owner of an animal registered by the Bureau of Animal Regulation and Care. The city explains the registry is maintained through a computer database using Chameleon software, and the requested information was pulled from the Chameleon database. Based on these representations, we agree the city must withhold the name, address, and telephone number of the owner of the animal at issue in the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 826.0311(a) of the Health and Safety Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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 the remaining information identifies a complainant who reported possible violations 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 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, the city may withhold the information we 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 remaining information at issue identifies a complainant for purposes of the informer's privilege. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 on that basis.

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 *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). 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.). We note the requestor has a right of access to information pertaining to her client and her client's minor child that would otherwise be confidential under common-law privacy. See Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access to records that contain information relating to the person that are protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves).

Upon review, we find some of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. However, we note one of the dates of birth at issue pertains to an individual who has been de-identified and whose privacy interest is, thus, protected. Accordingly, the city must withhold the remaining identifiable public citizen's date of birth and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Thus, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note the remaining information contains motor vehicle record information. Section 552.130 of the Government Code exempts from public disclosure 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.¹ See Gov't Code § 552.130. Thus, the city must withhold the submitted motor vehicle record information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

¹ The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

In summary, the city must withhold the name, address, and telephone number of the owner of the animal at issue in the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 826.0311(a) of the Health and Safety Code. The city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. The city must withhold the remaining identifiable public citizen's date of birth and the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the submitted motor vehicle record information under section 552.130 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,

Kimbell Kesling
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KK/mo

Ref: ID# 991002

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)