



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 30, 2008

Mr. John Danner  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of San Antonio  
P.O. Box 839966  
San Antonio, Texas 78283

OR2008-08781

Dear Mr. Danner:

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# 319052.

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for information related to complaint number 21187493. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception 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). The informer's privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police

---

<sup>1</sup>Although the city submitted no arguments in support of section 552.130, this is a mandatory exception and may not be waived. Accordingly, we will consider the applicability of this section. *See Gov't Code §§ 552.007, .352; Open Records Decision No. 674 at 3 n.4 (2001).*

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). 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 the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990).

You state that the submitted information contains identifying information of a person who reported possible violations of the city code to city employees charged with enforcement of the code, and that such violations are class "C" misdemeanors with possible fines of up to \$2,000. Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we conclude that the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer's privilege.

You also raise section 552.130 as an exception to disclosure. Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information that relates to "(1) a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state; (2) a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state; or (3) a personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or a local agency authorized to issue an identification document." Gov't Code § 552.130(a). We note that the submitted information does not contain information subject to section 552.130, and none of the remaining information may be withheld on this basis.

In summary, the city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code 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). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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,



Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/mcf

Ref: ID# 319052

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Lisa A. Santos  
112 East Pecan Street, Suite 2400  
San Antonio, Texas 78205  
(w/o enclosures)