



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 8, 2008

Ms. Loren B. Smith
Olson & Olson L.L.P.
Wortham Tower, Suite 600
2727 Allen Parkway
Houston, Texas 77019

OR2008-09221

Dear Ms. Smith:

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# 315040.

The City of Cleveland (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information regarding a specified case. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

You contend that the submitted incident report is protected by section 552.108 of the Government Code, which provides in part:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

...

(2) it is information that the deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication;

...

(b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

...

(2) the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2), (b)(2). Sections 552.108(a)(2) and 552.108(b)(2) protect information that relates to a concluded criminal investigation or prosecution that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. *Id.* A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) or section 552.108(b)(2) must demonstrate that the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *Id.* You state that the information at issue pertains to a concluded criminal investigation that did not result in a conviction or deferred adjudication. Accordingly, we agree that section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable.

We note, however, that section 552.108 of the Government Code does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. *Id.* § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Company v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). We note that basic information does not include motor vehicle record information or the marked account numbers. *See* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information made public by *Houston Chronicle*). Basic information includes, however, the identification and description of the complainant. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 187; *see also* ORD 127. In this instance, you assert that the identity of the complainant is protected by the common-law informer's privilege.

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 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. 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). Upon review, we find that the complainant reported a possible check fraud to the city's police department. Accordingly, the city may withhold the complainant's identifying information, which we have marked, from the basic information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

In summary, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the submitted police report under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.¹ In releasing the basic information, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

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).

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'B. Diener', written over a circular stamp or mark.

Benjamin A. Diener
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BAD/jh

Ref: ID# 315040

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Kelli Gist
2217 Windswept
Austin, Texas 79738
(w/o enclosures)