



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

May 1, 2013

Ms. Molly Cost  
Assistant General Counsel  
Office of General Counsel  
Texas Department of Public Safety  
P.O. Box 4087  
Austin, Texas 78773-0001

OR2013-07175

Dear Ms. Cost:

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# 485894 (PIR # 13-0572).

The Texas Department of Public Safety (the "department") received a request for the complete file concerning the requestor's Texas State Trooper trainee application. The department indicates it has released some of the requested information with social security numbers redacted pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> You claim 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 disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section 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

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision under the Act. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

enforcement authority, provided the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. 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. However, the privilege is not intended to protect the identities of public officials and employees who have a duty to report violations of the law. Because a public employee acts within the scope of his employment when filing a complaint, the informer's privilege does not protect the public employee's identity. Cf. *United States v. St. Regis Paper Co.*, 328 F. Supp. 660, 665 (W.D. Wis. 1971) (concluding that public officer may not claim informer's reward for service it is his or her official duty to perform).

You state the information you have marked identifies persons who reported possible criminal violations to the department. However, in this instance, most of the information you claim is protected under the informer's privilege was received by the department as background information as part of the requestor's employment application process. There is no indication the information at issue was reported to the department for law enforcement purposes or that the department treated it as such. In addition, the remaining information you have marked concerns a report that was made to the Copperas Cove Police Department. As the informer's privilege does not make information confidential by law but rather is a discretionary exception that exists to protect the interests of the governmental body that received the information, the department is not the appropriate entity to raise the informer's privilege with regard to the information at issue. Furthermore, the submitted information reveals the individual who made the initial report at issue was a department corporal acting within the scope of his employment. Thus, we find you have failed to demonstrate how any portion of the information you have marked consists of the identifying information of an individual who made the initial report of a civil or criminal violation to the department for purposes of the informer's privilege. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

You also raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law physical safety exception for the information you have marked. For many years, this office determined section 552.101, in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy, protected information from disclosure when "special circumstances" exist in which the disclosure of information would place an individual in imminent danger of physical harm. See, e.g., Open Records Decision Nos. 169 (1977) (special circumstances required to protect information must be more than mere desire for privacy or generalized fear of harassment or retribution), 123 (1976) (information protected by common-law right of privacy if disclosure presents tangible physical danger). However, the Texas Supreme Court has held freedom from physical harm does not fall under the common-law right to privacy.

*Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Cox Tex. Newspapers, L.P. & Hearst Newspapers, L.L.C.*, 343 S.W.3d 112, 117 (Tex. 2011) (“freedom from physical harm is an independent interest protected under law, untethered to the right of privacy”). Instead, in the *Cox* decision, the court recognized for the first time a separate common-law physical safety exception to required disclosure that exists independent of the common-law right to privacy. *Id.* at 118. Pursuant to this common-law physical safety exception, “information may be withheld [from public release] if disclosure would create a substantial threat of physical harm.” *Id.* In applying this new standard, the court noted “deference must be afforded” law enforcement experts regarding the probability of harm, but further cautioned, “vague assertions of risk will not carry the day.” *Id.* at 119.

You state commissioned department personnel are concerned the release of the information at issue will create a substantial threat of physical harm to certain individuals. Based on your representation and review, we find you have demonstrated the release of the information we have marked would create a substantial threat of physical harm to the individuals at issue. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law physical safety exception. However, we find you have not sufficiently demonstrated that a substantial risk of physical harm to the individuals at issue would result from disclosure of the remaining information you have marked. Thus, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

We note portions of the remaining information are protected by common-law privacy. Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) 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 demonstrated. *See id.* at 681-82. A compilation of an individual’s criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. U.S. Dep’t of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (finding significant privacy interest in compilation of individual’s criminal history by recognizing distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of criminal history information). A compilation of an individual’s criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. U.S. Dep’t of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (finding significant privacy interest in compilation of individual’s criminal history by recognizing distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of criminal history information). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen’s criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. This office also has found 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) (information pertaining to prescription drugs, specific illnesses, operations

and procedures, and physical disabilities protected from disclosure). Upon review, we find the information we have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law physical safety exception and common-law privacy. As no further exceptions to disclosure are raised for the remaining information, the department must release it.<sup>2</sup>

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,



Kenneth Leland Conyer  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KLC/bhf

Ref: ID# 485894

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>2</sup>We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. Because such information is confidential with respect to the general public, if the department receives another request for this information from a different requestor, the department must again seek a ruling from this office.