



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

January 16, 2004

Ms. Denise Obinegbo  
Open Records Specialist  
Richardson Police Department  
P.O. Box 831078  
Richardson, Texas 75083-1078

OR2004-0368

Dear Ms. Obinegbo:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 194434.

The Richardson Police Department (the "department") received a request for the complainant's name or phone number related to service numbers 00-059256 and 03-082014.<sup>1</sup> You state that the department has provided the requestor with the requested information related to service number 00-059256. However, you claim that service number 03-082014 is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

The informer's privilege, incorporated into the Act by section 552.101, has long been recognized by Texas courts.<sup>2</sup> *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). It protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided that the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer's privilege protects the identities of

---

<sup>1</sup>Because the requestor only seeks the complainant's name or phone number, any additional submitted information is not responsive to the request for information, and we will not address the applicability of the Public Information Act (the "Act") to it.

<sup>2</sup>Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision."

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 2 (1981) (citing Wigmore, Evidence, § 2374, at 767 (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 4-5 (1988).

Although you state that the alleged violation is related to section 22-142 of the Richardson City Ordinance, you have failed to demonstrate that the alleged violation would result in a civil or criminal penalty. Thus, we find that the department has not met its burden in adequately demonstrating that the informer’s privilege is applicable in this instance. See, e.g., Open Records Decision Nos. 542 (1990) (concluding that the Act places on a governmental body the burden of establishing why and how an exception applies to requested information), 532 (1989), 515 (1988), 252 (1980). Consequently, the department may not withhold the complainant’s identifying information pursuant to section 552.101 and the informer’s privilege.

Criminal history record information (“CHRI”) obtained from the National Crime Information Center (“NCIC”) or the Texas Crime Information Center (“TCIC”) is made confidential under federal and state law. Federal law governs the dissemination of CHRI obtained from the NCIC network. Federal regulations prohibit the release to the general public of CHRI that is maintained in state and local CHRI systems. See 28 C.F.R. § 20.21(c)(1) (“Use of criminal history record information disseminated to noncriminal justice agencies shall be limited to the purpose for which it was given”) and (c)(2) (“No agency or individual shall confirm the existence or nonexistence of criminal history record information to any person or agency that would not be eligible to receive the information itself”); see also Open Records Decision No. 565 at 10-12 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its own individual law with respect to CHRI that it generates. See *id.* at 10-12. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) of the Government Code authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. See Gov’t Code § 411.089(b). Thus, CHRI generated by the federal government or another state may be disclosed only in accordance with the federal regulations. Likewise, CHRI held by the Texas Department of Public Safety or another criminal justice agency must be withheld from the public as provided by subchapter F of chapter 411 of the Government Code. However, the responsive information does not contain any CHRI obtained from the NCIC or TCIC networks. Consequently, the responsive information may not be withheld from disclosure on this basis.

You also assert section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. This section excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate that the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. However, you

have failed to demonstrate that the submitted information pertains to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. Therefore, section 552.108(a)(2) is inapplicable to the requested information, and it may not be withheld from disclosure under this exception.

Finally, you assert section 552.130 of the Government Code. This section prohibits the release of information that relates to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state or a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. However, the responsive information does not contain any information that is subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code. Therefore, the responsive information must be released to the requestor.

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 Dep't of Pub. 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 Texas Building and Procurement 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. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. 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,



W. Montgomery Meitler  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

WMM/lmt

Ref: ID# 194434

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Roy Salazar  
408 High Brook  
Richardson, Texas 75080  
(w/o enclosures)