



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 29, 2004

Ms. Carla Showels Cook  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
1000 Throckmorton Street  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2004-5296

Dear Ms. Cook:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 204285.

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for information regarding the actual date of alleged ordinance violations and the identities of the complainants. You claim that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions 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." The informer's privilege, incorporated into the Public Information Act by section 552.101, protects the identity of persons who report violations of the law to officials having the duty of enforcing particular laws. *See Roviario v. United States*, 353 U.S. 53, 59 (1957). 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 addition, the informer's privilege protects the content of the communication only to the extent that it identifies the informant. *Roviario*, 353 U.S. at 60.

In this instance, alleged violations of the solid waste section of the city's Municipal Code were reported to the city department responsible for enforcement of the relevant section of the Code. You inform us that such a violation can result in a class "C" misdemeanor charge. Thus, we conclude that the complainant's identity may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with the informer's privilege, and we have marked the documents accordingly.

The submitted information also contains the e-mail addresses of other private citizens who were copied on the electronically transmitted complaint. Section 552.137 makes certain e-mail addresses confidential. In relevant part, section 552.137 provides:

(a) Except as otherwise provided by this section, an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under this chapter.

(b) Confidential information described by this section that relates to a member of the public may be disclosed if the member of the public affirmatively consents to its release.

Gov't Code § 552.137. Under section 552.137, a governmental body must withhold the e-mail address of a member of the general public, unless the individual to whom the e-mail address belongs has affirmatively consented to its public disclosure. *See id.* § 552.137(b). You do not inform us that a member of the public has affirmatively consented to the release of any e-mail address contained in the submitted materials. Therefore, you must withhold all e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137.

In summary, the city may withhold the marked information that identifies the informer under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer's privilege. The city must also withhold the marked e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released. Although you ask this office to issue a previous determination for "information regarding complainants who have given information regarding potential violations of the City's Ordinance," we decline to issue such a previous determination at this time. Accordingly, 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 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,

  
Marc A. Bafenblat  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MAB/jh

Ref: ID# 204285

Encl: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Kim Wall  
3625 Holly Springs Drive  
Fort Worth, Texas 76133  
(w/o enclosures)