



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 11, 2005

Mr. Paul Sarahan
Director, Litigation Division
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2005-01298

Dear Mr. Sarahan:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 218452.

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (the "commission") received a request for the file associated with a specified incident number. You inform us that you have released some of the requested information. You claim that the remaining 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.

Initially, we find that some of the submitted information consists of completed reports or investigations that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides in pertinent part:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Thus, the information is public unless it is expressly confidential under other law or excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. The common law informer's privilege, which you raise, is other law for the purpose of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328 (Tex. 2001); *Tex. Comm'n on Envtl. Quality v. Abbott*, No. GN-204227 (126th Dist. Ct., Travis County, Tex.). Therefore, we will consider your informer's privilege claim for the information that is subject to 552.022(a)(1), as well as for the submitted information that is not subject to section 552.022(a)(1).

The informer's privilege 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).

You state that the informers in this instance made allegations that, if true, would constitute a violation of section 330.4(a) of title 30 of the Texas Administrative Code. You also state that the informers reported this violation to the commission, the administrative entity responsible for enforcing this law under section 5.013 of the Texas Water Code. We understand violations of this law carry civil or criminal penalties. On this basis, and assuming that the requestor does not in fact know the identities of the informers, we conclude that the commission may withhold most of the submitted information that you have marked, as well as the additional information we have marked, under the common law informer's privilege. However, we have marked the information that is not excepted from disclosure under this privilege and which must be released 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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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,



Tamara L. Harswick
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TLH/sdk

Ref: ID# 218452

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Kerry Smith
P.O. Box 2528
Evergreen, Colorado 80437
(w/o enclosures)