



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

January 25, 2012

Ms. Rebecca Brewer  
Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd, & Joplin, P.C.  
P.O. Box 1210  
McKinney, Texas 75070-1210

OR2012-01260

Dear Ms. Brewer:

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# 443987.

The Town of Prosper (the "town"), which you represent, received a request for a specified call for service and police report. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108(a)(2) 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 . . . it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]" Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). Section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable only if the information at issue relates to a concluded criminal case that did not result in a conviction or deferred adjudication. A governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information the governmental body seeks to withhold. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *see Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You inform us that the submitted information pertains to a criminal investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on your representations and our review, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the submitted information.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure “basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.” Gov’t Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing 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). See Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information made public by *Houston Chronicle*). We note that basic information includes the identity and description of the complainant and a detailed description of the offense. See *id.* However, you contend that the identity of the complainant is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege.

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). The informer’s privilege protects 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. See Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1998), 208 at 1-2 (1978). The 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.” See Open Records Decision No. 279 at 2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. 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 the informer’s statement only to the extent necessary to protect the informer’s identity. See Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990).

You assert that the identity of the complainant is protected under the common-law informer’s privilege. In this instance, however, the submitted information reflects that the requestor, who is the subject of the complaint, already knows the informer’s identity. Consequently, you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of the common-law informer’s privilege to the complainant’s identity, and this information may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege.

You also claim that portions of the basic information are protected by common-law privacy. Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be demonstrated. See *id.* at 681-82. The type of information considered intimate and

embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. Upon review, we find that no portion of the basic information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the town may not withhold any of the basic information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, with the exception of basic information, the town may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup>

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, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Kenneth Leland Conyer  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KLC/agn

Ref: ID# 443987

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>1</sup>As our ruling for this information is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against its disclosure.