



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 22, 2014

Ms. Amy L. Sims
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of Lubbock
P.O. Box 2000
Lubbock, Texas 79457

OR2014-06467

Dear Ms. Sims:

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# 520206.

The City of Lubbock (the "city") received a request for records pertaining to any citation for a specified type of violation at specified locations between October 15, 2013, and the date of this request. You claim the submitted information is 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 public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses the 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. *See Open Records Decision No. 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 1-2 (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 (1988). We note the informer's privilege does not apply where the informant's identity is known to the individual who is the subject of the complaint. *See* Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978). Additionally, the privilege is not intended to protect the identities of public officials and employees who have a duty to report violations of the law. Because a public employee acts within the scope of his employment when filing a complaint, the informer's privilege does not protect the public employee's identity. *Cf. United States v. St. Regis Paper Co.*, 328 F. Supp. 660,665 (W.D. Wis. 1971) (concluding public officer may not claim informer's reward for service it is his or her official duty to perform).

You state the submitted information reveals the identities of complainants who reported violations of city ordinances to the city's Code Enforcement Division (the "division"). You explain the division is responsible for enforcing the relevant portion of the city ordinance. The subjects of the complaints do not know the identities of the complainants. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude the city has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to some of the information at issue, which we have marked. Therefore, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. However, you have not demonstrated how any of the remaining information identifies an individual who made the initial report of a possible violation of a city ordinance to the division for purposes of the informer's privilege. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, the remaining information 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Lana L. Freeman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LLF/bhf

Ref: ID# 520206

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)