

The ruling you have requested has been amended as a result of litigation and has been attached to this document.



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 4, 2005

Mr. Jesus Toscano, Jr.
Administrative Assistant City Attorney
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla, Room 7DN
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2005-07044

Dear Mr. Toscano:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 229491.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for "all of the reports submitted to the [city's] code enforcement office by" two named individuals for the past five years. 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 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. The common-law informer's privilege, incorporated into the 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). This privilege 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). It also 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 an informer’s statement only to the extent necessary to protect the informer’s identity. *See* Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990).

You state that one of the named informants reported violations of chapter 27 of the Dallas City Code to the city’s 3-1-1 operators, who then notified the city officials who are responsible for enforcing the city code. However, we note, and you acknowledge, that the requestor knows the identity of this informant. Therefore, we conclude that the requested information is not excepted from disclosure under the informer’s privilege. Thus, the city must release the submitted information in its entirety.

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); *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,



James A. Person III
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JAP/sdk

Ref: ID# 229491

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Monte Anderson
c/o Jesus Toscano, Jr.
City of Dallas
1400 South Lamar Street
Dallas, Texas 75215
(w/o enclosures)

CAUSE NO. GV404153

CITY OF DALLAS, TEXAS
Plaintiff,

V.

GREG ABBOTT, IN HIS OFFICIAL
CAPACITY AS ATTORNEY GENERAL OF
TEXAS,
Defendant.

§ IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF
§
§
§ TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS
§
§
§ 345TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT

Filed in The District Court
of Travis County, Texas

MAR 06 2006
8:41 AM
Alejandra Rodriguez-Mendoza, Clerk

AGREED FINAL JUDGMENT

On this date, the Court heard the parties' motion for agreed final judgment. Plaintiff City of Dallas, Texas, and Defendant Greg Abbott, Attorney General of Texas, appeared, by and through their respective attorneys, and announced to the Court that all matters of fact and things in controversy between them had been fully and finally compromised and settled. This cause is an action under the Public Information Act (PIA), Tex. Gov't Code Ann. ch. 552. The parties represent to the Court that, in compliance with Tex. Gov't Code Ann. § 552.325(c), the requestor, Monte Anderson, was sent reasonable notice of this setting and of the parties' agreement that the City may withhold the information at issue; that the requestor was also informed of his right to intervene in the suit to contest the withholding of this information; and that the requestor has not informed the parties of his intention to intervene. Neither has the requestor filed a motion to intervene or appeared today. After considering the agreement of the parties and the law, the Court is of the opinion that entry of an agreed final judgment is appropriate, disposing of all claims between these parties.

IT IS THEREFORE ADJUDGED, ORDERED AND DECLARED that:

1. The information at issue, the City's Call Log, specifically, Exhibit B to the City's submission to the Attorney General, is confidential under the common law informer's privilege and,

therefore, is excepted from disclosure by Tex. Gov't Code Ann. § 552.101.

2. The City may withhold from the requestor the information at issue.
3. All costs of court are taxed against the parties incurring the same;
4. All relief not expressly granted is denied; and
5. This Agreed Final Judgment finally disposes of all claims between Plaintiff and

Defendant and is a final judgment.

SIGNED this the 6 day of March, 2006.



PRESIDING JUDGE

APPROVED:



CHRISTOPHER J. CASO
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the Dallas City Attorney
Dallas City Hall
1500 Marilla, Room 7BN
Dallas, Texas 75201
Telephone: (214) 670-3519
Fax: (214) 670-0622
State Bar No. 03969230
ATTORNEY FOR PLAINTIFF



BRENDA LOUDERMILK
Chief, Open Records Litigation
Administrative Law Division
P. O. Box 12548, Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711-2548
Telephone: (512) 475-4292
Fax: (512) 320-0167
State Bar No. 12585600
ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT