



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 30, 2009

Mr. Warren M. S. Ernst
Chief, General Counsel Division
City of Dallas
1500 Marilla Room 7BN
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2009-15441

Dear Mr. Ernst:

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# 364804.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for the identity of the individual who made a complaint about the requestor's animal. You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code and privileged under Texas Rule of Evidence 508. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). The informer's privilege protects 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. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1998), 208 at 1-2 (1978)*. The 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." *See 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)*. The privilege excepts the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect the informer's identity. *See Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990)*.

You state the information at issue identifies an informant who reported a violation of section 7-7.4 of the Dallas City Code to the city's Code Compliance Department. You explain that the department is responsible for enforcing that section of the code. You inform us that a violation of that section is a misdemeanor punishable by a fine. Based on your representations, we find that the information at issue is protected by the common-law informer's privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 156 (1977) (name of person who makes complaint about another individual to city's animal control division is excepted from disclosure by informer's privilege so long as information furnished discloses potential violation of state law). We therefore conclude that the city may withhold the requested information on that basis under section 552.101 of the Government Code.¹

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Amy L.S. Shipp
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ALS/rl

Ref: ID# 364804

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

¹As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your other argument against disclosure.