



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 13, 2015

Ms. Theresa James  
City Attorney  
City of San Angelo  
Office of the City Attorney  
72 West College Avenue  
San Angelo, Texas 76903

OR2015-21366

Dear Ms. James:

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# 582822.

The City of San Angelo (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to the requestor. You state the city has released some of the requested information. You claim some of 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.

We note the city has redacted dates of birth in the submitted information. Pursuant to section 552.301 of the Government Code, a governmental body that seeks to withhold requested information must submit to this office a copy of the information, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the copy, unless the governmental body has received a previous determination for the information at issue or has statutory authorization to withhold the information without requesting a decision under the Act. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a), (e)(1)(D). The city does not assert, nor does our review of our records indicate, the city is authorized to withhold a date of birth without first seeking a ruling from this office. *See id.* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2000) (previous determinations). Therefore, this type of information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether it falls within the scope of an exception

to disclosure. However, because we can discern the nature of the redacted information, being deprived of the information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. Nonetheless, in the future, the city must not redact information from the information it submits to this office unless it is authorized to do so by statute or the information is the subject of a previous determination under section 552.301 of the Government Code. Failure to comply with section 552.301 may result in the information being presumed public under section 552.302 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Id.* § 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 a witness who provides information in the course of an investigation, but does not report a violation, is not an informer for purposes of the common-law informer's privilege.

You inform us the information you have marked reveals the identity of a complainant who reported a possible criminal violation of law to the city's police department. There is no indication the subject of the complaint knows the identity of the complainant. Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the information we have marked identifies the complainant; thus, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. However, upon review, we find the remaining information at issue does not identify an individual who reported a violation of law to a law enforcement agency or an appropriate administrative official. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

We understand you to assert the dates of birth you have redacted are excepted from public disclosure under common-law privacy, which is also encompassed by section 552.101 of the Government Code. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free

from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. In considering whether a public citizen's date of birth is private, the Third Court of Appeals looked to the supreme court's rationale in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of Texas*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). The supreme court concluded public employees' dates of birth are private under section 552.102 of the Government Code because the employees' privacy interest substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in disclosure.<sup>1</sup> *Texas Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Texas Comptroller*, the court of appeals concluded the privacy rights of public employees apply equally to public citizens, and thus, public citizens' dates of birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3. However, section 552.023 of the Government Code states a person has a special right of access to information that relates to the person and that is protected from disclosure by laws intended to protect the person's privacy interest. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (governmental body may not deny access to whom information relates or person's authorized representative on grounds that information is considered confidential by privacy principles). Accordingly, the requestor has a right of access to his own date of birth under section 552.023. The remaining date of birth you have redacted pertains to an individual who has been de-identified and whose privacy interest is, thus, protected. Thus, the city may not withhold the dates of birth you have redacted under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. The city must release the remaining information.<sup>2</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.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

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a).

<sup>2</sup>We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released in this instance. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); ORD 481 at 4. Therefore, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office.

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 black ink, appearing to read "N. A. Ybarra". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "N." and last name "Ybarra" clearly distinguishable.

Nicholas A. Ybarra  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

NAY/cbz

Ref: ID# 582822

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)