



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 1, 2008

Ms. Charlotte L. Staples
Taylor, Olson, Adkins, Sralla, & Elam, L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107-4654

OR2008-04291

Dear Ms. Staples:

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# 306099.

The City of North Richland Hills (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for multiple categories of information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in relevant part:

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[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information consists of a completed internal affairs investigation. Therefore, pursuant to section 552.022, the city must release the completed investigation unless it is confidential under other law or excepted from disclosure

under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The city raises section 552.103 for this information, but this is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). As such, section 552.103 does not qualify as "other law" that makes information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, the city may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, because information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) may be withheld under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code, we will address your claims under these sections.

We next address your claim under section 552.108 of the Government Code, as it is potentially the broadest of your claimed exceptions in this instance. The city argues that the submitted information is subject to section 552.108(a)(1), which excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime." Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). We note, however, that section 552.108 is generally not applicable to information relating to an administrative investigation that did not result in a criminal investigation or prosecution. *See Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525-26 (Tex. Civ. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 at 3-4 (1982). As previously noted, the submitted information consists of a completed internal affairs investigation, and you do not indicate that this investigation has resulted in a criminal investigation or prosecution. While you do inform us that the statute of limitations has not run on an ongoing "animal at large" case, you have not adequately demonstrated how release of the requested information, including the internal affairs investigation, would interfere with that case. Accordingly, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108 to the submitted information, and none of it may be withheld on that basis.

You also claim that the identity of the complainant in the submitted internal affairs investigation is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the common-law informer's privilege, which 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). The informer's 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).

In this instance, you state that the complainant at issue reported an alleged violation of a city ordinance to city law enforcement officers. We understand that the alleged violation at issue involved an "animal at large," which you state is a class C misdemeanor per the city's code of ordinances. You state that the alleged conduct is a violation of criminal law. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude that the city has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege in this instance. Thus, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer's privilege.

We note that some of the remaining submitted information is subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code.¹ Section 552.130 provides that information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title, or registration issued by a Texas agency is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1), (2). Accordingly, the city must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer's privilege. The city must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released.

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

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.130 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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 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,



Allan D. Meesey
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ADM/eeg

Ref: ID# 306099

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Stephen D. Harrison
Harrison & Steck, P.C.
1100 Sinclair Building
512 Main Street
Fort Worth, Texas 76102
(w/o enclosures)