



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 13, 2016

Ms. Josette Flores
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
The City of El Paso
P.O. Box 1890
El Paso, Texas 79950

OR2016-01002

Dear Ms. Flores:

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# 594042 (El Paso Case No. 15-1005-1214).

The City of El Paso (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified case. 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. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with 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, 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). However, individuals who provide information in the course of an investigation 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* Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978).

You state portions of the submitted information identify complainants who reported possible violations of section 42.092(b)(1) of the Texas Penal Code to the city's police department or the city's code enforcement personnel. You also state a violation of section 42.092(b)(1) is a state jail felony. *See* Penal Code § 42.092(c). You state you have no indication the subject of the complaints knows 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 marked information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. However, you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information consists of the identifying information of an individual who reported a criminal violation to the city for purposes of the informer's privilege. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *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.¹ *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. Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must generally withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

¹Section 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).

In this instance, we note the submitted information indicates the requestor is the wife of the individual whose information is at issue, and may be acting as his authorized representative. As such, the requestor may have a right of access to her spouse's information under section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(b) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Therefore, if the requestor is acting as her spouse's authorized representative, she has a right of access to his information pursuant to section 552.023(a), and it may not be withheld from her under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, if the requestor is not acting as her spouse's authorized representative, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code.² Section 552.130 provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit, a motor vehicle title or registration, or a personal identification document issued by an agency of Texas or another state or country is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a). We note section 552.130 protects personal privacy. Accordingly, the requestor has a right of access to her own motor vehicle record information under section 552.023 of the Government Code, and it may not be withheld from her under section 552.130. *See id.* § 552.123(a); ORD 481 at 4. Therefore, to the extent the motor vehicle record information we have marked belongs to the requestor, the city may not withhold it under section 552.130 of the Government Code and must release it. Additionally, some of the motor vehicle record information we have marked belongs to the requestor's spouse. As noted above, the requestor may be the authorized representative of her spouse, and may have a right of access to his information. *See id.* § 552.023; *see* ORD No. 481 at 4. Accordingly, if the requestor is acting as her spouse's authorized representative, then the city may not withhold the information we have marked that pertains to her spouse under section 552.130 of the Government Code. However, if the requestor is not acting as her spouse's authorized representative, then the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked that pertains to her spouse under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

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 generally withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. However, if the requestor is acting as her spouse's authorized representative, then she has a right of access

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

to this individual's information under section 552.023 of the Government Code. Further, to the extent the motor vehicle record information we have marked belongs to the requestor, she has a right of access to this information under section 552.023 of the Government Code. 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, 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, ,



Nicholas A. Ybarra
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NAY/bhf

Ref: ID# 594042

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)