



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 6, 2015

Ms. Alexis G. Allen  
Counsel for the City of Rowlett  
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, L.L.P.  
500 North Akard Street  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2015-23438

Dear Ms. Allen:

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# 587313 (ORR# 73253).

The City of Rowlett (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for a specified offense report involving the requestor. 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.

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. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by other statutes. For many years, this office determined section 552.101, in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy, protected information from disclosure when "special circumstances" exist in which the disclosure of information would place an individual in imminent danger of physical harm. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 169 (1977) (special circumstances required to protect information must be more than mere desire for privacy or generalized fear of harassment or retribution), 123 (1976) (information protected by common-law right of privacy if disclosure presents tangible physical danger). However, the Texas Supreme Court has held freedom from physical harm does not fall under the common-law right to privacy. *Tex. Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Cox Tex. Newspapers, LP. & Hearst Newspapers, LLC*, 343 S.W.3d 112 (Tex. 2011) (holding "freedom from physical harm is an independent interest

protected under law, untethered to the right of privacy”). Instead, in *Cox*, the court recognized, for the first time, a separate common-law physical safety exception to required disclosure that exists independent of the common-law right to privacy. *Id.* at 118. Pursuant to this common-law physical safety exception, “information may be withheld [from public release] if disclosure would create a substantial threat of physical harm.” *Id.* In applying this new standard, the court noted “deference must be afforded” law enforcement experts regarding the probability of harm, but further cautioned that “vague assertions of risk will not carry the day.” *Id.* at 119. You state the requested information identifies an undercover officer. You explain the release of the undercover officer’s name would jeopardize the safety of the undercover officer. Based on your representations and our review, we agree the city must withhold the name of the undercover officer under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law physical safety exception.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also 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). 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. *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)*. However, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make a report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer’s privilege. 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)*. 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 ORD 208 at 1-2*.

You state the remaining information “references information provided by a confidential informant, including a statement that might tend to reveal the informer’s identity[.]” Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated the information at issue identifies an individual who reported a criminal violation for purposes of the informer’s privilege. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege.

In summary, the city must withhold the name of the undercover officer under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law physical safety exception. The city must release the remaining information.

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 black ink, appearing to read "Claire Morris Sloan". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Claire V. Morris Sloan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 587313

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)