



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 18, 2012

Ms. Jennafer G. Tallant
Counsel for the City of Carrollton
Denton, Navarro, Rocha & Bernal
2517 North Main Avenue
San Antonio, Texas 78212

OR2012-11135

Dear Ms. Tallant:

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# 459134.

The City of Carrollton (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident. You claim the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108(b)(2) excepts from disclosure "[a]n 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 . . . if . . . 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(b)(2). Section 552.108(b)(2) is applicable only if the information at issue relates to a concluded criminal case that did not result in a conviction or deferred adjudication. A governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information the governmental body seeks to withhold. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A). You state the submitted information relates to a closed case that did not result in a conviction or deferred adjudication. Accordingly, we agree section 552.108(b)(2) is generally applicable to the submitted information

Section 552.108 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 Co. 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). See Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information made public by *Houston Chronicle*). In this instance, the submitted information consists entirely of a call sheet from a Computer Aided Dispatch (“CAD”) system. In Open Records Decision No. 649 (1996), this office concluded that information contained in a CAD report is substantially the same as basic information and thus is not excepted from public disclosure under section 552.108. See ORD 649 at 3; see also Open Records Decision No. 394 at 3 (1983) (no qualitative difference between information contained in police dispatch records or radio logs and front-page offense report information expressly held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*). Therefore, because the submitted information consists entirely of basic information, it may not be withheld under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

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 informer’s privilege, incorporated into the Act by section 552.101, has long been recognized by Texas courts. *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). It 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 (1998), 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 (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. However, the informer’s privilege protects the content of the communication only to the extent that it identifies the informant. *Roviaro v. United States*, 353 U.S. 53, 60 (1957).

You indicate the information you have marked identifies an individual who reported a possible violation of the law to the city’s police department, which has the authority to enforce criminal law. The submitted information does not indicate the subject of the complaint knows the identity of the reporting party. Thus, we conclude the city may withhold the identifying information of the complainant, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege. However, the remaining information you have marked does not identify the complainant, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to

the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The type of information considered intimate or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city may withhold the identifying information of the complainant, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. The remaining information must be released.

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,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/som

Ref: ID# 459134

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)