



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 24, 2012

Ms. Jessica D. Richard
Assistant City Attorney
City of New Braunfels
P.O. Box 311747
New Braunfels, Texas 78131-1747

OR2012-07932

Dear Ms. Richard:

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# 454631 (ORR 2012.148).

The City of New Braunfels (the "city") received a request for (1) any e-mails for a specified time period and (2) any records regarding the requestor.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information contains the requestor's fingerprints. Access to fingerprint information is governed by sections 560.001, 560.002, and 560.003 of the Government Code. Section 560.001 provides in part that "[i]n this chapter . . . '[b]iometric

¹You inform us that the city sought and received clarification of item one of the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

²Although you also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 552.108 of the Government Code, this office has concluded section 552.101 does not encompass other exceptions found in the Act. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990).

identifier' means a retina or iris scan, fingerprint, voiceprint, or record of hand or face geometry." Gov't Code § 560.001(1). Section 560.003 provides that "[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under [the Act]." *Id.* § 560.003. Section 560.002 provides, however, that "[a] governmental body that possesses a biometric identifier of an individual . . . may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose the biometric identifier to another person unless . . . the individual consents to the disclosure[.]" *Id.* § 560.002(1)(A). Thus, section 560.002(1)(A) of the Government Code gives an individual or his authorized representative a right of access to his own fingerprint information. Thus, the requestor has a right of access to his own fingerprints, which we have marked, under section 560.002(1)(A). Although you assert this information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code, statutes governing the release of specific information prevail over the general exceptions to disclosure found in the Act. *See* Attorney General Opinion DM-146 at 3 (1992); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 613 at 4 (1993) (exceptions to Act cannot impinge on statutory right of access to information), 451 (1986) (specific statutory right of access provisions overcome general exceptions to disclosure under Act). Therefore, the city must release the fingerprints we have marked to the requestor under section 560.002 of the Government Code.

Section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime [if] release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime." Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You inform us that the remaining information relates to a pending criminal investigation being conducted by the city's police department and the Texas Rangers. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the release of this information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Therefore, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the remaining information.

As you acknowledge, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure "basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime." Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Such basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-87; Open Records Decision No. 127 (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). We note basic information includes the identity and description of the complainant and a detailed description of the offense. *See id.* However, we understand you to claim that the identifying information of the complainant may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with 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. This exception encompasses information protected by 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 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 the subject of the information does not already know the informer’s identity. *See 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 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law* § 2374, at 767 (J. 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)*.

You contend the information at issue reveals the identity of a complainant who reported an alleged forgery offense to the city’s police department. You inform us that the city’s police department is responsible for enforcing the laws at issue, which are punishable by criminal penalties. You also inform us that the city has no indication that the subject of the complaint knows the identity of the complainant. Therefore, based on your representations and our review, we conclude the city may withhold the complainant’s identifying information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege. However, you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue identifies or tends to identify an individual who made a report of possible violations to the city’s police department, and this information may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

In summary, the city must release the fingerprints we have marked to the requestor under section 560.002 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege. With the exception of basic information, which you state will be released to the requestor, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'KLC', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Kenneth Leland Conyer
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KLC/dls

Ref: ID# 454631

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)