



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 29, 2016

Ms. Andrea D. Russell
Counsel for the Town of Flower Mound
Taylor Olson Adkins Sralla Elam, L.L.P.
6000 Western Place, Suite 200
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2016-04750

Dear Ms. Russell:

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# 605885.

The Town of Flower Mound (the "town"), which you represent, received a request for the contact information for the individual who filed a specified complaint. You state the town is withholding motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code.¹ You also state the town is withholding certain information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).² You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the requestor seeks only the contact information for the specified complainant. You have submitted a document that contains information beyond this specific

¹Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 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).

²Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

piece of information. Thus, the portions of the submitted document that do not consist of the information requested are not responsive to the present request. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the town is not required to release that information in response to the request.

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. 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. *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, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make a 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 ORD 208* at 1-2.

You state the responsive information identifies a complainant who reported violations of law to the town. You also state a violation of the relevant law carries criminal penalties. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude the town has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer’s privilege to the information at issue. Therefore, the town may withhold the responsive information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege.³

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.

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of the submitted information.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Claire V. Morris Sloan". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "C" and "M".

Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 605885

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)