



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

March 30, 2009

Mr. Jesús Toscano, Jr.  
Administrative Assistant City Attorney  
City of Dallas  
1500 Marilla, Room 7BN  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2009-04120

Dear Mr. Toscano:

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# 342875.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for a specified complaint about the requestor's dogs. You claim that portions of the submitted complaint are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception 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. This section 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). 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 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. However, the informer's privilege protects the content of the communication only to the extent it identifies the informant. *Roviaro v. United States*, 353 U.S. 53, 60 (1957).

You have highlighted information within the submitted complaint, and you assert that this information identifies an individual who reported a possible violation of a city animal control ordinance. You state that violations of the ordinance provisions in question are punishable by fines. Based on your representations, we conclude the city may withhold the complainant's identifying information that you highlighted under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. The remaining information at issue must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,



Reg Hargrove  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RJH/sdk

Ref: ID# 342875

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)