



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 24, 2008

Mr. Gary A. Scott
Assistant City Attorney
City of Conroe
P. O. Box 3066
Conroe, Texas 77305

OR2008-03754

Dear Mr. Scott:

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# 305343.

The City of Conroe (the "city") received a request for information related to complaints of barking dogs in a specified neighborhood. You state that some of the requested information has been provided to the requestor. You claim that the submitted 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.

Initially, we note that you have redacted portions of the submitted information. You do not assert, nor does our review of our records indicate, that the city has been authorized to withhold any such information without seeking a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2000). Because we can discern the nature of the information that has been redacted, being deprived of this information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling in this instance. Nevertheless, be advised that a failure to provide this office with requested information generally deprives us of the ability to determine whether information may be withheld and leaves this office with no alternative other than ordering that the redacted information be released. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body must provide this office with copy of "specific information requested"), .302.

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 informer's privilege, incorporated into the Act by section 552.101, has long been recognized by Texas courts. *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 (1998), 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); *see* 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 complaints at issue were reported to the "[the city's] officers [who are] charged with enforcement of [the] law" and the complaints consist of reports by citizens of alleged violations of the city's Code of Ordinances. You also state that violation of this code constitutes a misdemeanor and is punishable by a fine. Based on your representations and our review, we agree that the information identifying the complainants in this case is protected under the informer's privilege. Accordingly, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101. We note, however, that the city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of the informer's privilege to the remaining information. Therefore, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

You claim that the remaining submitted information is excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Section 552.108(a) excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication." Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(2), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). In this instance, you state that "the requested case report involves a case that has been concluded[,] and that "the conclusion was a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication." We note, however, that the submitted information contains numerous case reports, and you have failed to identify which of the submitted cases concluded in such a result. Consequently, you have failed to establish the applicability of section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code and none of the remaining information may be withheld on this basis.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with the informer's privilege. As you raise no other arguments against disclosure, the remaining information must be released.¹

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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

¹We note that the submitted information contains social security numbers subject to section 552.147 of the Government Code. Section 552.147(b) authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Gov't Code § 552.147.

complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Loan Hong-Turney
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LH/eeg

Ref: ID# 305343

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Pat Bonner
342 Maple Lane
Conroe, Texas 77304
(w/o enclosures)