



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 19, 2022

Mr. David V. Overcash  
Counsel for the City of Anna  
Wolfe, Tidwell & McCoy, L.L.P.  
2591 Dallas Parkway, Suite 300  
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2022-39325

Dear Mr. Overcash:

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# 991662 (File No. W004209-092122).

The City of Anna (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You also state you will redact dates of birth pursuant to Open Records Letter No. 2019-14751 (2019).<sup>1</sup> You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception 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 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). The city states the marked portions of Exhibit 2 pertain to a pending criminal investigation. Based upon 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*

---

<sup>1</sup> Open Records Letter No. 2019-14751 is a previous determination issued to the city authorizing it to withhold the dates of birth of public citizens under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without seeking a ruling from this office. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (listing elements of second type of previous determination under section 552.301(a) of the Government Code).

*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 information you marked. Therefore, the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

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). 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 city states the information you marked contains the identifying information of complainants who reported possible criminal activities to the city’s police department. Upon review, we conclude the city has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer’s privilege to some of the information at issue. Therefore, 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.

As noted above, you state you will redact dates of birth pursuant to Open Records Letter No. 2019-14751. 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 doctrine of the common-law 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*

---

<sup>2</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

*Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3 (Tex. App—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). 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 identifiable public citizens' dates of birth you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city may withhold the information you marked under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government 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 identifiable public citizens' dates of birth you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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# 991662

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)