



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 20, 2004

Ms. Melissa Barloco
Assistant County Attorney
Harris County
1019 Congress, 15th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002

OR2004-0432

Dear Ms. Barloco:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 197173.

The Harris County Constable Precinct 8 (the "constable") received a request for information concerning a DWI report. You claim that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." The informer's privilege, incorporated into the Public Information Act by section 552.101, 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). 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 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). In *Rovario v. United States*, 353 U.S. 53, 59 (1957), the United States Supreme Court explained the rationale that underlies the informer's privilege:

What is usually referred to as the informer's privilege is in reality the Government's privilege to withhold from disclosure the identity of persons who furnish information of violations of law to officers charged with enforcement of that law. [Citations omitted.] The purpose of the privilege is the furtherance and protection of the public interest in effective law enforcement. The privilege recognizes the obligation of *citizens* to communicate their knowledge of the commission of crimes to law-enforcement officials and, *by preserving their anonymity, encourages them to perform that obligation.* [Emphasis added.]

As noted above, the purpose of the informer's privilege is to protect the identity of *citizens* in order to encourage the reporting of violations of the law. We do not believe that the informer's privilege was intended to protect the identities of law-enforcement officials whose duties include the reporting of crime. Thus, the informer's privilege does not apply to the identity of the police officer. Accordingly, the information you have marked is not protected by the informer's privilege.

Next, the submitted information contains a social security number and motor vehicle information that are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.130 of the Government Code respectively. A social security number is excepted from required public disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with the 1990 amendments to the federal Social Security Act, 42 U.S.C. § 405(c)(2)(C)(viii)(I), if it was obtained or is maintained by a governmental body pursuant to any provision of law enacted on or after October 1, 1990. See Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). Section 552.130 excepts from disclosure information that relates to motor vehicle information issued by an agency of this state. See Gov't Code § 552.130. However, because these provisions protect a person's privacy, the requestor has a special right of access under section 552.023 to her own information. Gov't Code § 552.023 (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access to information held by governmental body that relates to the person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect the person's privacy interests). Thus, the social security number and motor vehicle information must be released to the requestor.

Finally, the submitted information includes breath test results of the requestor's blood alcohol content. Full information concerning the analysis of the specimen must be made available upon the request of the person who has given a specimen at the request of a peace officer. Transp. Code § 724.018. Thus, the constable must release the breath test results to the requestor.

In summary, none of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure. The constable must release the submitted information to the requestor in its entirety.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Melissa Vela-Martinez". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping "M" and "V".

Melissa Vela-Martinez
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MVM/sdk

Ref: ID# 197173

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Mary Gammons
707 El Dorado Boulevard, #1104
Houston, Texas 77062
(w/o enclosures)