



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL
GREG ABBOTT

February 4, 2003

Ms. Stephanie Gonzalez
Assistant City Attorney
City of Lewisville
P.O. Box 299002
Lewisville, Texas 75029-9002

OR2003-0726

Dear Ms. Gonzalez:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 176065.

The City of Lewisville (the "city") received a request for information concerning a complaint called in to animal control on November 12, 2002 regarding a city resident. You state that you have released some of the requested information. However, you claim that the remainder of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

We first address your argument under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Section 552.108 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure certain records of law enforcement agencies and prosecutors. Section 552.108 applies only to records created by an agency, or a portion of an agency, whose primary function is to investigate crimes and enforce criminal laws. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 493 (1988), 287 (1981). Section 552.108 generally does not apply to records created by an agency whose chief function is essentially regulatory in nature. Open Records Decision No. 199 (1978). An agency that does not qualify as a law enforcement agency may, under certain limited circumstances, claim that section 552.108 protects records in its possession. *See, e.g.,* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision Nos. 493 (1988), 272 (1981). If an administrative agency's investigation reveals possible criminal conduct that the administrative agency intends to report or has already reported to the appropriate law enforcement agency, section 552.108 will apply to information gathered by the administrative agency if its release would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1); Attorney General Opinion

MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision Nos. 493 (1988), 272 (1981). You have not explained to this office how the city's animal control is a law enforcement agency, nor have you told us that the records at issue have been forwarded to an appropriate law enforcement agency. Therefore, we have no basis for ruling that the information may be withheld under section 552.108.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Section 826.0311 of the Health and Safety Code provides in relevant part:

[i]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 Chapter 552, Government Code.

Health & Safety Code 826.0311(a). The submitted documents contain copies of animal registration certificates. This information is not from the city's actual registry. Section 826.0311(a) does not apply to information other than a city's actual registry of dogs and cats as stated in the plain language of the provision. We conclude that the information is not confidential under section 823.0311 of the Health and Safety Code and may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

The informer's privilege, incorporated into the Public Information Act by section 552.101, 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). 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). In this instance, the individual whose identifying information is at issue reported an alleged violation of a specified city ordinance. You tell us that this ordinance is a prosecutable criminal offense. Therefore, we conclude that you may withhold the complainant's name and telephone number under section 552.101 in conjunction with the informer's privilege. You must release the remainder of the information to the requestor.

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. 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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Jennifer E. Berry".

Jennifer E. Berry
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JEB/sdk

Ref: ID# 176065

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Lance L. Shurtleff, President
Animal Rescue League
P.O. Box 294375
Lewisville, Texas 75029-4375
(w/o enclosures)