



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 22, 2016

Ms. Debra L. Goetz
Counsel for McAllen Independent School District
Atlas, Hall & Rodriguez, LLP
P.O. Box 3725
McAllen, Texas 78502-3725

OR2016-14215

Dear Ms. Goetz:

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# 615343.

The McAllen Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for the investigation files from a specified time period contained within the requestor's personnel file. You state you redacted student-identifying information from the submitted documents pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.135 of the

¹The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office FERPA does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental or student consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act. The DOE has determined FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>

Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.²

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. *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. Additionally, the privilege is not intended to protect the identities of public officials and employees who have a duty to report violations of the law. Because a public employee acts within the scope of his employment when filing a complaint, the informer’s privilege does not protect the public employee’s identity. *Cf. United States v. St. Regis Paper Co.*, 328 F. Supp. 660,665 (W.D. Wis. 1971) (concluding public officer may not claim informer’s reward for service it is his or her official duty to perform). Upon review, we find you have not identified any specific law alleged to have been violated, nor have you explained whether any violation carries civil or criminal penalties. Accordingly, we find the district failed to demonstrate the submitted information identifies an informer for purposes of the common-law informer’s privilege, and the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.135 of the Government Code provides in relevant part the following:

- (a) “Informer” means a student or a former student or an employee or former employee of a school district who has furnished a report of another person’s

²We assume the “representative sample” of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 499* (1988), *497* (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

or persons' possible violation of criminal, civil, or regulatory law to the school district or the proper regulatory enforcement authority.

(b) An informer's name or information that would substantially reveal the identity of an informer is excepted from [required public disclosure].

(c) Subsection (b) does not apply:

(1) if the informer is a student or former student, and the student or former student, or the legal guardian, or spouse of the student or former student consents to disclosure of the student's or former student's name; or

(2) if the informer is an employee or former employee who consents to disclosure of the employee's or former employee's name; or

(3) if the informer planned, initiated, or participated in the possible violation.

Gov't Code § 552.135(a)-(c). Because the legislature limited the protection of section 552.135 to the identity of a person who reports a possible violation of "law," a school district that seeks to withhold information under that exception must clearly identify to this office the specific civil, criminal, or regulatory law that is alleged to have been violated. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A). Additionally, witnesses and other individuals who provide information in the course of an investigation are not informants for purposes of section 552.135 of the Government Code. You argue the submitted information identifies individuals who reported an alleged violation of criminal and civil laws. Upon review, however, we find the district has failed to demonstrate the submitted information reveals the identity of an informer for the purposes of section 552.135 of the Government Code. Therefore, the district may not withhold the submitted information on that ground.

We note the submitted information contains an e-mail address that is subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code.³ 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* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the district must withhold the personal e-mail address we

³The 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).

marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner affirmatively consents to its public disclosure.⁴ The district 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,



Meagan J. Conway
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MJC/akg

Ref: ID# 615343

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

⁴We note Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information, including an e-mail address of a member of the public under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.