



October 9, 2001

Mr. G. Chadwick Weaver
First Assistant City Attorney
City of Midland
P.O. Box 1152
Midland, Texas 79702-1152

OR2001-4548

Dear Mr. Weaver:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 153081.

The City Attorney's Office for the City of Midland (the "city") received a request for "identification of the party" that made a complaint to the city Animal Control Shelter pertaining to two of the requestor's cats. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer's privilege. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

In *Roviaro v. United States*, 353 U.S. 53, 59 (1957), the United States Supreme Court explained the rationale that underlies the informer's privilege:

What is usually referred to as the informer's privilege is in reality the Government's privilege to withhold from disclosure the identity of persons who furnish information of *violations of law to officers charged with enforcement of that law*. [Citations omitted.] The purpose of the privilege is the furtherance and protection of the public interest in effective law enforcement. The privilege recognizes the obligation of citizens to communicate their knowledge of the commission of crimes to law-enforcement officials and, *by preserving their anonymity*, encourages them to perform that obligation. [Emphasis added.]

The "informer's privilege" aspect of section 552.101 protects the identity of persons who report violations of the law. When information does not describe conduct that violates the law, the informer's privilege does not apply. Open Records Decision Nos. 515 (1988), 191

(1978). Although the privilege ordinarily applies to the efforts of law enforcement agencies, it can apply to administrative officials with a duty of enforcing particular laws. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision Nos. 285, 279 (1981); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 208 (1978). This may include enforcement of quasi-criminal civil laws. Open Records Decision Nos. 515 (1988), 391 (1983).

In this instance, the individual whose identity is at issue filed a complaint alleging that the requestor was allowing two of his cats to run loose. You represent that this alleged conduct constitutes a violation of a specified city ordinance. However, you do not explain, nor does any of the submitted information indicate the criminal or civil penalties, if any, that may result from a violation of the ordinance in question. Therefore, you have failed to demonstrate that the informer's privilege applies in this instance. *Cf.* Open Records Decisions No. 156 (1977) (granting informer's privilege for the identity of an individual who reported to a city animal control division a possible violation of a statute that carried with it criminal penalties). Because the city has not met its burden of demonstrating the applicability of the claimed exception, we conclude the requested information must be released.¹

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be

¹Because the remaining information contained in the submitted documents that does not identify the complainant is unresponsive to the request, we do not address here whether any other information contained in these documents is excepted from public disclosure. Because the remaining information is not responsive to the present request, the city is not required to release it.


provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the General Services Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Michael Garbarino
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MG/seg

Ref: ID# 153081

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Scott W. Long
3708 Casady Court
Midland, Texas 79707
(w/o enclosures)