



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 3, 2013

Ms. Josette Flores
Assistant City Attorney
City of El Paso
2 Civic Center Plaza, 9th Floor
El Paso, Texas 79901-1196

OR2013-00111

Dear Ms. Flores:

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# 475020.

The City of El Paso (the "city") received a request for any documents pertaining to a specified dangerous dog investigation. You state you have released some of the requested information to the requestor. You claim that some of the submitted information is 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 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses the 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). However, 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. We note the informer's privilege does not apply where the informant's identity is known to the individual who is the subject of the complaint. *See* ORD 208 at 1-2.

You state the submitted information reveals the identity of one or more complainants who reported possible violations of section 7.08.030 of the city code to the city's police department or Animal Control personnel, in their capacity as code enforcement officers. You explain the alleged violations are misdemeanors punishable by fines. You state there is no indication the subject of the complaint knows the identity of any complainant. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the city may withhold the identifying information of one of the complainants, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 156 (1977) (name of person who makes complaint about another individual to city's animal control division is excepted from disclosure by informer's privilege so long as information furnished discloses potential violation of state law). However, we note the submitted information reflects the subject of the complaint knows the identity of another complainant. Further, you have not demonstrated how any of the remaining information identifies an individual who made the initial report of a criminal violation to the city for purposes of the informer's privilege. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis. As you raise no further exceptions against disclosure, the city must release the remaining information.

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 'Sarah Casterline', with a large circular flourish at the end.

Sarah Casterline
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SEC/tch

Ref: ID# 475020

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)