



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

May 8, 2008

Mr. C. Patrick Phillips  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
1000 Throckmorton Street  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2008-06308

Dear Mr. Phillips:

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# 309724.

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for a specified offense report. You state that you have redacted social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> You also state that the city will withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information pursuant to previous determinations issued to the city in Open Records Letter Nos. 2006-14726 (2006) and 2007-00198 (2007). *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 at 7-8 (2001). You claim that portions of the remaining information are exempted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the information you have submitted.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. The 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

---

<sup>1</sup>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(b).

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). 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 informant at issue reported an alleged violation of the Penal Code to the Fort Worth Police Department (the "department"). You state that the department is responsible for investigating and enforcing the law in question. We note that the statute at issue carries criminal penalties. Thus, 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 pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer's privilege. We note, however, that the remaining information consists of the age, gender, race, and date of birth of the informant. This information does not consist of identifying information of the informer; therefore, the city may not withhold the remaining information it has marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with the informer's privilege.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the internal records and notations of law enforcement agencies and prosecutors when their release would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1); see also Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989) (quoting *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706, 710 (Tex. 1977)). Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect "information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State." See *City of Ft. Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no writ). This office has concluded that section 552.108(b) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. See, e.g., Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (Gov't Code § 552.108 is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted).

To claim section 552.108(b)(1), a governmental body must explain how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Gov't Code §§ 552.108(b)(1), .301; Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). Generally

known policies and techniques may not be withheld under section 552.108. *See, e.g.*, ORD 531 at 2-3 (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force are not protected under predecessor to section 552.108), 252 at 3 (governmental body did not meet burden because it did not indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

You argue that release of the remaining information at issue would interfere with law enforcement. As noted above, the remaining information at issue consists of the age, gender, race, and date of birth of the informant. You have not explained how release of this information would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Accordingly, we conclude that the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with the informer's privilege. The remaining 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 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,



Melanie J. Villars  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MJV/jh

Ref: ID# 309724

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Masid Masad  
7205 Trinidad Drive  
North Richland Hills, Texas 76180  
(w/o enclosures)