



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 1, 2006

Mr. Mario R. Gutierrez  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of New Braunfels  
P. O. Box 311747  
New Braunfels, Texas 78131-1747

OR2006-14116

Dear Mr. Gutierrez:

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# 265889.

The City of New Braunfels (the "city") received two requests for information pertaining to the two requestors and three specified addresses from May 31, 2005 to the present. You inform us that the city asked the requestors for clarification of some of the requested information. You have not indicated that the city has received the requested clarification from the requestors as of the date of the city's request for a decision from our office. Accordingly, we conclude that the city need not respond to this portion of these requests until it receives the requestors' clarification. We note, however, that when the city does receive the clarification, it must seek a ruling from us before withholding from the requestors any information that may be responsive to those items of the requests for information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 663 (1999) (providing for tolling of ten-business-day deadline for requesting attorney general decision while governmental body awaits clarification). You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions 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 claim that portions of the submitted information may be withheld under the informer’s privilege, which is encompassed by section 552.101. The informer’s privilege has long been recognized by Texas courts. *E.g.*, *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). 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 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). 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. 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). However, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation, but who do not make the initial report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer’s privilege. Having considered your arguments, we conclude you have not established that the informer’s privilege is applicable to the information at issue; thus, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground.

Section 552.108(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime.” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You inform us that one of the submitted incident reports relates to a pending criminal prosecution. Based on your representations, we conclude that the release of this report would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the information at issue.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code 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. You state that the remaining

submitted information relates to criminal investigations that have concluded in results other than conviction or deferred adjudication. Accordingly, we agree that section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the remaining submitted information.

However, section 552.108 does not except basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov't Code § 552.108(c). Such basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. See 531 S.W.2d at 186-87. Thus, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the submitted information under subsections 552.108(a)(1) and (a)(2) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup>

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); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

---

<sup>1</sup>As we are able to resolve this under section 552.108, we do not address your other claims for exception of the information, except to note that basic information may not be withheld from public disclosure under section 552.103. Open Records Decision No. 597 (1991).

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 Office of the Attorney General 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,



Jaime L. Flores  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLF/eb

Ref: ID# 265889

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Larry Crull  
1051 Running River  
New Braunfels, Texas 78130  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. James Swiney  
1051 Running River  
New Braunfels, Texas 78130  
(w/o enclosures)