



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 17, 2005

Mr. Mark G. Mann
Assistant City Attorney
City of Garland
P.O. Box 469002
Garland, Texas 75046-9002

OR2005-01467

Dear Mr. Mann:

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# 218704.

The Garland Police Department (the "department") received two requests for incident report nos. 2004R028748 and F0427479S, which you claim refer to the same report. You state that you have released some information to the requestor, but claim that portions of the submitted information are 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." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the common law informer's privilege, which 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). The privilege excepts an informer’s statement only to the extent necessary to protect the informer’s identity. See Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990). However, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make the initial report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer’s privilege.

You explain that the individual for whom the informer’s privilege is claimed reported an alleged aggravated assault to the department. Having reviewed the submitted information, we agree that the majority of the information you have highlighted in yellow may be withheld pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common law informer’s privilege. See Open Records Decision Nos. 279 at 2 (1981), 156 (1977) (granting informer’s privilege for the identity of an individual who reported to a city animal control division a possible violation of a statute that carried with it criminal penalties). However, some of the information you have highlighted in yellow is not protected under section 552.101 in conjunction with the common law informer’s privilege and may not be withheld on that basis. We have marked this information for release.

You also claim that the Texas motor vehicle information you have highlighted in green is subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code, providing in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if the information relates to:

(1) a motor vehicle operator’s or driver’s license or permit issued by an agency of this state; [or]

(2) a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state[.]

Therefore, the Texas motor vehicle information highlighted in green falls within the scope of section 552.130. However, section 552.023(a) provides a special right of access to a person or a person’s authorized representative “beyond the right of the general public, to [confidential] information held by a governmental body that relates to the person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person’s privacy interests.” Section 552.130 is intended to protect the privacy rights of individuals. In this instance, one of the requestors is the individual to whom the highlighted motor vehicle information pertains. Therefore, the department must release the highlighted motor vehicle information to the requestor to whom the information pertains under section 552.023, but must withhold this information under section 552.130 from the requestor to whom this information does not pertain.

In summary, with the exception of the information we have marked for release, the department may withhold the information highlighted in yellow under section 552.101 in conjunction with the common law informer's privilege. The department must release the highlighted motor vehicle information to the requestor to whom the information pertains under section 552.023, but must withhold this information under section 552.130 from the requestor to whom this information does not pertain. The department must release all remaining information.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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); *Tex. 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,


Marc A. Barenblat
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MAB/sdk

Ref: ID# 218704

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Robert Towers
Eligibility Consultants Inc.
P.O. Box 460036
Garland, Texas 75046-9935
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Brown
4351 Point Boulevard #1107
Garland, Texas 75043
(w/o enclosures)