



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 27, 2016

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

OR2016-09486

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# 607351 (Ref. No. 16-1005-1281).

The City of El Paso (the "city") received a request for animal services records related to a specified address during a specified time period. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 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 public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses section 826.0211 of the Health and Safety Code, which provides, in part:

(a) Information contained in a rabies vaccination certificate or in any record compiled from the information contained in one or more certificates that identifies or tends to identify an owner or an address, telephone number, or other personally identifying information of an owner of a vaccinated animal is confidential and not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code. The information contained in the certificate or record may not include the social security number or the driver's license number of the owner of the vaccinated animal.

Health & Safety Code § 826.0211(a). We note section 826.0211 is applicable only to information contained in a rabies vaccination certificate or in a record compiled from

information contained in one or more rabies vaccination certificates. The submitted information includes a rabies vaccination certificate. Therefore, the city must withhold the owner's identifying information within the submitted rabies vaccination certificate, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 826.0211 of the Health and Safety Code.

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); *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 identify an individual who reported to the city's police department and the city's animal services department violations of the city code. You state such violations are criminal misdemeanors punishable by fine. 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. Therefore, the city may withhold the identifying information of the informer under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 523* (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), *373* (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Additionally, 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*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or a personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release.² Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code states that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Therefore, the city must withhold the partial credit card number we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, an Internet website address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, or an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees. The e-mail address at issue does not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c), and you do indicate the owner of the e-mails address has consented to release of his e-mail address. Therefore, the

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).

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).*

city must withhold the personal e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the owner's identifying information within the submitted rabies vaccination certificate, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 826.0211 of the Health and Safety Code. The city may withhold the identifying information of the informer under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the partial credit card number we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 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,



Lee Seidlits
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CLS/bw

Ref: ID# 607351

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)