



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 12, 2016

Ms. Leticia Brysch
City Clerk
City of Baytown
P.O. Box 424
Baytown, Texas 77522-0424

OR2016-10875

Dear Ms. Brysch:

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# 609977 (Baytown PIR# 6106).

The City of Baytown (the "city") received a request for the report made to the city's animal control pertaining to the requestor's residence. The city claims portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the city claims 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. The city raises 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. *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.

The city states some of the submitted information identifies a complainant who reported a violation of a city ordinance to the city's Animal Control Division (the "division"). The city explains the division is responsible for enforcing the relevant portions of the city ordinance. The city further states a violation of the relevant city ordinance carries criminal penalties. The city also states the subject of the complaint does not already know the identity of the informer. Based upon these representations and our review, we conclude the city has demonstrated the applicability of the common-law informer's privilege to some of the submitted information. Therefore, with the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city may withhold the information it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law informer's privilege. However, we find the information we have marked for release 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. As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, 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,



Rahat Huq
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RSH/som

Ref: ID# 609977

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)