



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 5, 2007

Ms. Mary R. Risner  
Director, Litigation Division  
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality  
P.O. Box 13087  
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

OR2007-13023

Dear Ms. Risner:

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# 291019.

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (the "commission") received two requests for information related to complaints of illegal dumping in Coryell County. You state that a portion of the requested information has been released to the requestors. You claim that the identities of the individuals who filed the complaints are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

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. The informer's privilege, incorporated into the Act by section 552.101, has long been recognized by Texas courts. *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

---

<sup>1</sup>We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

the information does not already know the informer's identity. Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1998), 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). However, the informer's privilege protects the content of the communication only to the extent that it identifies the informant. *Roviaro v. United States*, 353 U.S. 53, 60 (1957).

You state that the submitted complaints report alleged violations of chapter 335 of title 30 of the Texas Administrative Code. You explain that the commission has "the authority to regulate waste discharges and the quality of water in [Texas]." *See* Water Code § 26.011. You also state that the commission's rules "prohibit the disposal of hazardous waste without a permit." *See* 30 Tex. Admin. Code § 335.43. You further state that there are administrative and civil penalties for a violation of the code sections at issue. *See id.*, *see also* Water Code §§ 7.052, 7.102. Based on your arguments and our review, we conclude that the commission may withhold the informants' identifying information that we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the informer's privilege. However, the remaining information the commission seeks to withhold identifies an individual who reported the alleged violation to a property owner, rather than the commission. Accordingly, this information is not protected under the informer's privilege, and thus, may not be withheld on this basis. As you raise no further exceptions against disclosure, the remaining information must be released.

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).

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,



Loan Hong-Turney  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LH/jb

Ref: ID# 291019

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Kathy Karasek  
1906 Straws Mill Road  
Gatesville, Texas 76528  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brandon S. Belt  
113 South 7<sup>th</sup> Street  
Gatesville, Texas 76528  
(w/o enclosures)