



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 1, 2016

Ms. Josette Flores
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of El Paso
P.O. Box 1890
El Paso, Texas 79950-1890

OR2016-04899

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# 600209 (El Paso Reference No. 15-1005-1241).

The City of El Paso (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified incident and copies of two specified reports. You state you will release some information to the requestor. 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.

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, 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).

You state some of the submitted information identifies complainants who reported a violation of a city ordinance to the city’s police department and/or the city’s code enforcement personnel. You explain the alleged violations are misdemeanors punishable by fine. You also inform us that you have no indication the subject of the complaints knows the identities of the complainants. Based on your representation and our review, we conclude the city may withhold the identifying information of the complainants 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).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 826.0211 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides, in part:

(a) Information contained in a rabies vaccination certificate or in any record compiled from the information contained in one or more certificates that identifies or tends to identify an owner or an address, telephone number, or other personally identifying information of an owner of a vaccinated animal is confidential and not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code. The information contained in the certificate or record may not include the social security number or the driver’s license number of the owner of the vaccinated animal.

Health & Safety Code § 826.0211(a). We note section 826.0211 is applicable only to information contained in a rabies vaccination certificate or in a record compiled from information contained in one or more rabies vaccination certificates. The remaining information includes a rabies vaccination certificate. Therefore, the city must withhold the owner’s identifying information within the information at issue, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 826.0211 of the Health and Safety Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the identifying information of the complainants under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege. The city must withhold the owner’s identifying information within the submitted rabies vaccination certificate, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the

Government Code in conjunction with section 826.0211 of the Health and Safety Code. 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, 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,



Kenny Moreland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KJM/som

Ref: ID# 600209

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)