



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 20, 2013

Ms. Linda Pemberton
Paralegal
Office of the City Attorney
City of Killeen
P.O. Box 1329
Killeen, Texas 76540-1329

OR2013-20235

Dear Ms. Pemberton:

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# 506290 (ORR# W011524).

The City of Killeen (the "city") received a request for case numbers 13-010713 and 13-010422 and all 9-1-1 calls from a specified address during a specified time period. You state the city has released some of the requested information. You claim the submitted 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(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]" Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state case numbers 13-010713 and 13-010422 and call for service numbers 1603666 and 1606368 pertain to active criminal investigations or prosecutions. Based on your representation, we conclude the release of the information at issue would interfere with the

detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to case numbers 13-010713 and 13-010422 and call for service numbers 1603666 and 1606368.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. *See 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 has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). You state call for service numbers 1171920, 1579519, 1603709, and 8028569 are part of closed investigations that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on these representations and our review, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to call for service numbers 1171920, 1579519, 1603709, and 8028569.

However, we note 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*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). We note basic information includes, among other items, a detailed description of the offense and the identity and description of the complainant. *See* ORD 127 at 3-4. Thus, with the exception of the basic information, the city may withhold case numbers 13-010713 and 13-010422 and call for service numbers 1603666 and 1606368 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code and may withhold call for service numbers 1171920, 1579519, 1603709, and 8028569 under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

You argue portions of the basic information are subject to section 552.101 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” *Gov't Code* § 552.101. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). 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). 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. 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 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* Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978).

You state portions of the basic information, which you have marked, identify complainants who reported violations of law to the city's police department (the "department"). Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude the city has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to some of the information at issue, which we have marked. Therefore, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. However, the subject of the complaint is aware of the identity of the complainant in some of the records at issue. Moreover, you have not demonstrated how any of the remaining information identifies an individual who made the initial report of a criminal violation to the department 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.

Portions of the remaining basic information are subject to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of 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 satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Generally, only highly intimate information that implicates the privacy of an individual is withheld. However, in certain instances, where it is demonstrated the requestor knows the identity of the individual involved as well as the nature of certain incidents, the entire report must be withheld to protect the individual's privacy. In this instance, you seek to withhold some of the basic information in its entirety under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, you have not demonstrated, nor does it otherwise appear, this is a situation in which the entirety of the information at issue must be withheld on the basis of common-law privacy. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the entirety of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis. Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked

under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated how any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, with the exception of the basic information, the city may withhold case numbers 13-010713 and 13-010422 and call for service numbers 1603666 and 1606368 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code and may withhold call for service numbers 1171920, 1579519, 1603709, and 8028569 under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. In releasing the basic information, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege and must withhold the information we 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 506290

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)