



July 25, 2001

Mr. Charles R. Anderson
Deputy City Attorney
City of Irving
825 West Irving Boulevard
Irving, Texas 75060

OR2001-3238

Dear Mr. Anderson:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 149839.

The City of Irving (the "city") received a request for a dog bite incident report dated 4/8/01, and any other incident reports involving the same dog or home address. You claim that the requested 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.

We note that the submitted information includes information that is subject to section 552.022. Section 552.022(a) enumerates categories of information that are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code unless they are expressly confidential under other law. The information that you submitted to us for review appears to be a completed report or investigation, which falls into one of the categories of information made expressly public by section 552.022. Gov't Code section 552.022(a)(1). Section 552.022(a)(1) states that a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body is expressly public unless it is excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is confidential by law.

You claim that some of the information is protected from disclosure under the informer's privilege. The informer's privilege, incorporated into the Public Information Act by

section 552.101,¹ 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); *see also Roviario v. United States*, 353 U.S. 53, 59 (1957). The informer's privilege under *Roviario* exists to protect a governmental body's interest. Therefore, the informer's privilege under *Roviario* may be waived by a governmental body and is not "other law" that makes the information confidential under section 552.022. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 6 (1990).

However, the informer's privilege is also found in Rule 508 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. Recently, the Texas Supreme Court held that "[t]he Texas Rules of Civil Procedure and Texas Rules of Evidence are 'other law' within the meaning of section 552.022." *In re City of Georgetown*, No. 00-0453, 2001 WL 123933, at *8 (Tex. Feb. 15, 2001). Thus, we will determine whether the information is confidential under Rule 508.

Rule 508 provides, in relevant part:

(a) Rule of Privilege. The United States or a state or subdivision thereof has a privilege to refuse to disclose the identity of a person who has furnished information relating to or assisting in an investigation of a possible violation of a law to a law enforcement officer or member of a legislative committee or its staff conducting an investigation.

(b) Who May Claim. The privilege may be claimed by an appropriate representative of the public entity to which the information was furnished, except the privilege shall not be allowed in criminal cases if the state objects.

You inform us that the individual has furnished information relating to conduct that violates Chapter 6, Section 6-6 of the Code of Civil and Criminal Ordinances of the city, and that the information was provided to a city officer with the authority to enforce this ordinance. We have no information that would lead us to conclude that the informer's identity has been disclosed to those who would have cause to resent the communication. Tex. R. Evid. 508(c)(1). Based upon your representation and our review of the submitted information, we find that the identity of the person who furnished the information is protected under the informer's privilege as stated in Rule 508 of the Texas Rules of Evidence, and must be withheld until such time as it appears from the evidence in the case or from other showing by a party that the informer may be able to give testimony necessary to a fair determination of a material issue on the merits in a civil case to which the city is a party, or on guilt or innocence in a criminal case, and the city invokes the privilege, at which time the court shall give the city an opportunity to show in camera facts relevant to

¹Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision."

determining whether the informer can, in fact, supply that testimony. Tex. R. Evid. 508(c)(2).

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the General Services Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for

contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Cindy Nettles". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name being more prominent.

Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/seg

Ref: ID# 149839

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Gerald R. Cope
2504 Rollinshire Court
Bedford, Texas 76021
(w/o enclosures)