



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

May 27, 2014

Ms. Ashley Dierker  
Counsel for City of Southlake  
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam LLP  
6000 Western Place, Suite 200  
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2014-09033

Dear Ms. Dierker:

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# 523877.

The City of Southlake (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to Southlake's Bark & Purr Pet Retreat, specifically any complaints, records of inspection, investigations, or citations. You state the city will redact information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code, section 552.147(b) of the Government Code, and Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).<sup>1</sup> You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsections 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). 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 a decision from this office. *See id.* § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* ORD 684.

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 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. This office has concluded information that either identifies or tends to identify a victim of sexual assault or other sex-related offense must be withheld under common-law privacy. Open Records Decision No. 393 at 2 (1983); *see also Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such information). Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

You claim 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 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 Nos. 515 at 3 (1998), 208 at 1-2 (1978). The 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.” *See* 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 involve 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 also seek to withhold the identifying information of individuals who reported possible criminal violations to the city’s police department. There is no indication that the subject of the complaint is aware of the informer’s identity. Based on your representation and our review, we agree 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. However, you do not inform us what criminal or civil statutes were reported to be violated in the remaining information. Therefore, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the applicability of the informer’s privilege to the remaining information. Accordingly, the

city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](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,



Megan G. Holloway  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MGH/eb

Ref: ID# 523877

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)