



February 6, 2002

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

OR2002-0557

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# 158256.

The City of Midland (the "city") received two requests for information regarding a named individual, one of which seeks all documentation regarding the individual, the other which seeks a specified police report on the individual. You claim that the requested 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.

We first consider the request from an individual who appears to be employed by the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (the "department"). If the requestor is acting in an official capacity on behalf of the department, then the city has the discretion to release the information pursuant to an intergovernmental transfer. We ruled in Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999) that whether a governmental entity may release information to another governmental entity is not a question under the Public Information Act (the "Act") as the Act is concerned with the required release of information to the *public*. Gov't Code §§ 552.001, .002, .021; *see* Attorney General Opinions, H-683 (1975), H-242 (1974), M-713 (1970); Open Records Decision No. 655 (1997). For many years, this office has recognized that it is the public policy of this state that governmental bodies should cooperate with each other in the interest of the efficient and economical administration of statutory duties. *See, e. g.*, Attorney General Opinion H-836 (1976); Open Records Decision No. 655 (1997). *But see* Attorney General Opinions DM-353 at 4 n. 6 (1995) (interagency transfer prohibited where confidentiality statute enumerates specific entities to which release of confidential information is authorized and where receiving agency is not among statute's enumerated entities), JM-590 (1986) (same); Open Records Decision No. 655 (1997) (same), 650 (1996) (transfer of confidential information to federal agency impermissible unless federal law

requires its disclosure). In adherence to this policy, this office has acknowledged that information may be transferred between governmental bodies without violating its confidential character on the basis of a recognized need to maintain an unrestricted flow of information between governmental bodies. See Attorney General Opinions H-836 (1976), H-242 (1974), M-713 (1970); Open Records Decision Nos. 655 (1997), 414 (1984). Accordingly, the city has the discretion to release the requested information to the department if the information is confidential. However, should you decline to exercise that discretion, you must nonetheless adhere to the following decision regarding the applicability of your claimed exception to the requested information.

The department seeks "all documentation" regarding the named individual. Under *United States Department of Justice v. Reporters Committee for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749 (1989), where an individual's criminal history information has been compiled or summarized by a governmental entity, the information takes on a character that implicates the individual's right of privacy in a manner that the same individual records in an uncompiled state do not. Thus, when a requestor asks for all information concerning a certain named individual and that individual is a possible suspect, a law enforcement agency must withhold this information under section 552.101 because that individual's privacy right has been implicated. See *id.* After reviewing the department's request and the submitted documents, we conclude that the department seeks an individual's criminal records as contemplated by the Court in *Reporters Committee*. Thus, we find that the information requested by the department is confidential in its entirety under section 552.101 and the holding in *Reporters Committee*. As a result, the city has discretion to decline to release the requested information to the department.

Next, we consider the request from Barbara Keith for a particular murder report. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with the informer's privilege. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." The Texas courts have recognized the informer's privilege. See *Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). It protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided that 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 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 2 (1981) (citing Wigmore, Evidence, § 2374, at 767 (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 4-5 (1988). 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).

You indicate that the submitted information reflects that several individuals gave information about violations of the law to officers charged with enforcing that law. However, you have not marked or indicated which of the many individuals' identities in the police report the city wishes to withhold under the informer's privilege. Because you have failed to comply with section 552.301(e)(2), we find that the requested information is not excepted from disclosure under the informer's privilege and section 552.101. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(e)(2), .302. Thus, you must release the report to Ms. Keith with the exception of the information discussed below.

The submitted report contains an individual's social security number. A social security number may be excepted from required public disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the 1990 amendments to the federal Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), if it was obtained or is maintained by a governmental body pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. *See* Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). Therefore, prior to releasing any social security number information, you should ensure that no such information was obtained or is maintained by the city pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990.

Finally, we note that section 552.130 excepts from public disclosure information relating to a driver's license or motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state. Thus, you must also withhold the Texas driver's license numbers in the submitted report under section 552.130.

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 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 Texas Building and Procurement 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,



Kristen Bates  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KAB/sdk

Ref: ID# 158256

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Barbara Keith-Stephney  
3335 Epson Street  
Las Vegas, Nevada 89129  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Trina Henry  
1616 Headway Circle, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Austin, Texas 78754  
(w/o enclosures)