



August 1, 2002

Ms. Meredith Ladd
Brown & Hofmeister, L.L.P.
1717 Main Street, Suite 4300
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2002-4215

Dear Ms. Ladd:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 166572.

The City of McKinney (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for police reports from three addresses during specified time periods. You indicate that the city does not have any reports regarding one of the listed addresses. We note that the Public Information Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. *Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.--San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986). With respect to the information relating to the other two addresses, 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.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." You first claim that the submitted information contains identifying information of informants that should be protected under the informer's privilege in conjunction with section 552.101. See *Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); Open Records Decision Nos. 582 (1990), 515 (1988). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identity of an informant, provided that the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1998), 208 at 1-2 (1978). However, the informer's privilege does not categorically protect from release the identification and description of a complainant, which is front page offense report information generally considered public by *Houston Chronicle*. See Gov't Code § 552.108(c); *Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177, 187 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), writ refused n.r.e. per curiam, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976); Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976). The identity of a complainant, whether an "informant" or not, may only be withheld upon a showing that special circumstances exist.

We have addressed several special situations in which front page offense report information may be withheld from disclosure. For example, in Open Records Decision No. 366 (1983), this office agreed that the statutory predecessor to section 552.108 protected from disclosure information about an ongoing undercover narcotics operation, even though some of the information at issue was front page information contained in an arrest report. The police department explained how release of certain details would interfere with the undercover operation, which was ongoing and was expected to culminate in more arrests. Open Records Decision No. 366 (1983); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 333 at 2 (1982); *cf.* Open Records Decision Nos. 393 (1983) (identifying information concerning victims of sexual assault), 339 (1982), 169 at 6-7 (1977), 123 (1976).

Here, the only individuals listed in the submitted information as having reported potential violations of the law are also listed as complainants. You have not shown special circumstances sufficient to overcome the presumption of public access to the identities of the complainants. Consequently, we conclude that the city may not withhold the identities of the complainants based on the informer's privilege.

You also contend that portions of the submitted information are confidential under chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code. Chapter 772 of the Health and Safety Code authorizes the development of local emergency communications districts. Sections 772.118, 772.218, and 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code apply only to an emergency 9-1-1 district established in accordance with chapter 772. *See* Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996). These statutes make confidential the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers that are furnished by a service supplier. *Id.* at 2. Section 772.118 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than two million. Section 772.218 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 860,000. Section 772.318 applies to an emergency communication district for a county with a population of more than 20,000. You contend that the originating telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers contained in the submitted information are confidential under chapter 772. To the extent the submitted addresses and telephone numbers of 9-1-1 callers were supplied by a 9-1-1 service supplier to a 9-1-1 district that is subject to section 772.118, 772.218, or 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code, the addresses and telephone numbers must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code as information deemed confidential by statute. However, if the telephone numbers and addresses were not provided by a 9-1-1 service supplier to a 9-1-1 district subject to section 772.118, 772.218, or 772.318, the addresses and telephone numbers must be released.

Next, you contend that one of the submitted reports is confidential under section 58.007 of the Family Code. Section 58.007 makes certain juvenile law enforcement records confidential. Family Code section 51.04(a) states that the Juvenile Justice Code, Title 3 of the Family Code, "covers the proceedings in all cases involving the delinquent conduct or

conduct indicating the need for supervision engaged in by a person who was a child within the meaning of [Title 3] at the time he engaged in the conduct.” Thus, section 58.007 deems confidential law enforcement records from all cases involving a child engaging in delinquent conduct or conduct indicating the need for supervision. After reviewing the crime report at issue, we conclude that it is not the type of record that section 58.007 covers because it does not involve juvenile delinquent conduct or conduct indicating the need for supervision, as defined in section 51.03 of the Family Code. Therefore, we conclude that the crime report is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007 of the Family Code.

We note, however, that the report at issue contains information that must be withheld under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 provides in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from the requirement of Section 552.021 if the information relates to:

- (1) a motor vehicle operator’s or driver’s license or permit issued by an agency of this state; [or]
- (2) a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state[.]

Therefore, the city must withhold the Texas driver’s license number contained in the submitted information under section 552.130.

In summary, the city must withhold the telephone numbers and addresses of 9-1-1 callers to the extent the telephone numbers and addresses were supplied by a 9-1-1 service supplier to a 9-1-1 district that is subject to section 772.118, 772.218, or 772.318 of the Health and Safety Code. Furthermore, the city must withhold the Texas driver’s license number contained in the submitted information under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remainder of the submitted information.

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); *Tex. Dep't of Pub. 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. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. 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,



Nathan E. Bowden
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NEB/sdk

Ref: ID# 166572

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Charlotte L. Vitz
2110 Chippendale Drive
McKinney, Texas 75071
(w/o enclosures)