



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 19, 2012

Mr. George E. Hyde  
For City of Carrollton  
Denton, Navarro, Rocha & Bernal, P.C.  
2500 West William Cannon, Suite 609  
Austin, Texas 78745

OR2012-11208

Dear Mr. Hyde:

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# 459357.

The City of Carrollton (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for the audio recording of a 911 call and report pertaining to a specific incident. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A); Open Records Decision No. 434 at 2-3 (1986). You state the information submitted as Exhibits C and D relates to an investigation that did not result in a conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on your representation, we agree 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the information at issue.

However, 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). 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 deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). In this instance, the submitted information includes computer-assisted-dispatch ("CAD") records. In Open

Records Decision No. 649 (1996), this office concluded information contained in a CAD report is substantially the same as basic information. *See* ORD 649 at 3; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 394 at 3 (1983) (there is no qualitative difference between information contained in radio cards or radio logs and front-page offense report information expressly held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*; thus, such information is generally public). Accordingly, with the exception of basic information contained in the CAD report found in Exhibit C, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108(a)(2) 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. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the common-law informer's privilege, which has long been recognized by Texas courts. *E.g.*, *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 informer's 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 No. 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 1-2 (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 (1988). The privilege excepts the informer's statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990). We note individuals who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make the initial report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer's privilege.

You assert the informer's privilege for the identifying information of the 911 caller in the remaining information. However, you do not inform us what criminal or civil statute was reported to be violated. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law right to privacy, which protects information if it (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). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be met. *Id.* at 681-82. Common-law privacy protects the types of information held to be intimate or embarrassing in *Industrial Foundation*. *See id.* at 683 (information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and

injuries to sexual organs). This office has found that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). Upon review, we find a portion of the remaining basic information, which we have marked, is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the city must withhold the marked information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find none of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, with the exception of basic information contained in the CAD report found in Exhibit C, the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(2). In releasing basic information, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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,



Jeffrey W. Giles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JWG/dls

Ref: ID# 459357

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)