



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 4, 2015

Ms. Aimee Alcorn  
Assistant City Attorney  
Legal Department  
City of Corpus Christi  
P.O. Box 9277  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469-9277

OR2015-15949

Dear Ms. Alcorn:

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# 573948 (CCPD File Dcan1).

The Corpus Christi Police Department (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to a specified offense report. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.108, and 552.152 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. This section encompasses the common-law informer's privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *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). 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).

You state portions of the submitted information, which you have marked, identify a confidential informant who reported violations of criminal law to the department. Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude the department has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer’s privilege to some of the information at issue, which we have marked. Therefore, the department may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege.<sup>1</sup> However, you have not demonstrated how any of the remaining information identifies an informant for purposes of the informer’s privilege. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides, in part:

...

(b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]

Gov’t Code § 552.108 (b)(1). Section 552.108(b)(1) protects internal law enforcement and prosecution records, the release of which would interfere with law enforcement and prosecution efforts in general. See *City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320, 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.) (section 552.108(b)(1) protects information that if released would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate state laws). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. See Gov’t Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A); see also *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). The statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b)(1) protected information that would reveal

---

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

law enforcement techniques. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (detailed use of force guidelines), 456 (1987) (information regarding location of off-duty police officers), 413 (1984) (sketch showing security measures to be used at next execution). The statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b)(1) was not applicable to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (Penal Code provisions, common-law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

You state the information you have marked “consists of detailed investigative techniques and measures employed by the [d]epartment while dutifully carrying out its operations.” You assert the information at issue details operations of the department in obtaining information from confidential informants as well as strategies and procedures used by undercover officers. You assert release of the information at issue would “reveal weaknesses to criminals, jeopardize officer and informant safety and undermine police efforts.” Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate how the release of any portion of the remaining information would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution efforts in general. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.152 of the Government Code provides:

Information in the custody of a governmental body that relates to an employee or officer of the governmental body is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if, under the specific circumstances pertaining to the employee or officer, disclosure of the information would subject the employee or officer to a substantial threat of physical harm.

Gov’t Code § 552.152. You represent the release of the undercover officers’ identities would subject the officers to a substantial threat of physical harm. Therefore, we find section 552.152 is applicable to the identities of the undercover officers within the information at issue. Accordingly, the department must withhold the identifying information of the undercover officers, which you have marked, under section 552.152 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department may withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege. The department must withhold the identifying information of the undercover officers, which you have marked, under section 552.152 of the Government Code. 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](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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Paige Lay".

Paige Lay  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PL/bhf

Ref: ID# 573948

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)