



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 26, 2012

Ms. Michele Tapia
Assistant City Attorney
City of Carrollton
1945 East Jackson Road
Carrollton, Texas 75006

OR2012-15354

Dear Ms. Tapia:

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# 466146.

The City of Carrollton (the "city") received a request for a specified incident report. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim 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. This section encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, including section 261.201 of the Family Code, which provides, in part, as follows:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act] and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

¹We understand you to raise section 552.102(a) based on the substance of your arguments.

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

...

(k) Notwithstanding Subsection (a), an investigating agency, other than the [Texas Department of Family and Protective Services] or the Texas Youth Commission, on request, shall provide to the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child who is the subject of reported abuse or neglect, or to the child if the child is at least 18 years of age, information concerning the reported abuse or neglect that would otherwise be confidential under this section. The investigating agency shall withhold information under this subsection if the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of the child requesting the information is alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect.

(l) Before a child or a parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child may inspect or copy a record or file concerning the child under Subsection (k), the custodian of the record or file must redact:

...

(2) any information that is excepted from required disclosure under [the Act], or other law[.]

Fam. Code § 261.201(a), (k), (l)(2). Upon review, we agree the submitted report was used or developed in an investigation by the city's police department of alleged or suspected child abuse under chapter 261. *See id.* § 261.001(1)(E) (definition of child abuse includes sexual assault under Penal Code section 22.011); Penal Code § 22.011(c)(1) (defining "child" for purposes of Penal Code section 22.011 as person under 17 years of age). In this instance, however, we note the requestor is the father of the child victim listed in the submitted report. Further, the requestor is not the individual alleged to have committed the suspected abuse. Thus, the city may not use subsection 261.201(a) to withhold the submitted report from this requestor. Fam. Code § 261.201(k). However, subsection 261.201(l)(2) states any information that is excepted from required disclosure under the Act or other law may still be withheld from disclosure. *Id.* § 261.201(l)(2). Thus, we will address your remaining arguments against disclosure of the submitted report.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 58.007 of the Family Code. The relevant language of section 58.007 reads:

(c) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records and files concerning a child and information stored, by electronic means or otherwise, concerning the child from which a record or file could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult files and records;

(2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as records or files relating to adults, be accessible under controls that are separate and distinct from controls to access electronic data concerning adults; and

(3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subchapters B, D, and E.

Id. § 58.007(c). Juvenile law enforcement records relating to delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision that occurred on or after September 1, 1997, are confidential under section 58.007. *See id.* § 51.03(a), (b) (defining “delinquent conduct” and “conduct indicating a need for supervision”). For purposes of section 58.007(c), “child” means a person who is ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age at the time of the reported conduct. *See id.* § 51.02(2). Section 58.007(c) is not applicable to information that relates to a juvenile as a complainant, victim, witness, or other involved party and not as a suspect or offender. You seek to withhold the submitted information under section 58.007(c). However, the submitted information does not identify a suspect or offender who is ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age. As such, section 58.007 is not applicable and the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 on this basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses the common-law informer’s privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *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 common-law 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 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. 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 individual who reported a possible violation of the law to the city’s police department, which has the authority to enforce criminal law. You do not indicate, nor does it appear, the subject of the complaint knows the identity of the informant. Based on your representation and our review, the city may withhold the identifying information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege.

You also argue some of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to the case of *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) (court finds that legitimate law enforcement interests exist to withhold certain information related to active criminal cases). In this regard, we understand you to argue the information at issue is excepted under section 552.101 of the Government Code as information made confidential by judicial decision. However, *Houston Chronicle* did not determine the confidentiality of any information for purposes of section 552.101. See Open Records Decision Nos. 658 at 4 (1998), 478 at 2 (1987), 465 at 4-5 (1987) (confidentiality protected by section 552.101 requires express language making certain information confidential or requires that information not be released to public). Accordingly, we determine none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with the court’s holding in *Houston Chronicle*.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). In this instance, the highlighted birth dates pertain to private citizens. Thus, we find none of the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.102(a) and none of it may be withheld on that basis.

In summary, the city may withhold the information 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.²

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,



Michelle R. Garza
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MRG/som

Ref: ID# 466146

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

²Because this requestor has a special right of access to the information being released, if the city receives another request for this same information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office.