



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 9, 2010

Mr. R. Kinley Hegglund, Jr.  
Senior Assistant City Attorney  
City of Wichita Falls  
P.O. Box 1431  
Wichita Falls, Texas 76307

OR2010-10152

Dear Mr. Hegglund:

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# 385913 (City ID# 126).

The City of Wichita Falls (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to times animal control has been called out to three specified properties. You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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. 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*. 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 that the information you have marked reveals the identity of an individual who reported various possible violations of the city code of ordinances to a city animal control officer. However, you do not state, and our review of the submitted information does not indicate, whether there is any civil or criminal penalty for such violations. Accordingly, the city has failed to demonstrate that the informer's privilege applies to the information you marked. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the marked information under section 552.101 in conjunction with the informer's privilege. As no further exceptions are raised, the submitted information must be released to the requestor.

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](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,



Laura Ream Lemus  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LRL/eeg

Ref: ID# 385913

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)