OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL · STATE OF TEXAS
JOHN CORNYN

June 7, 2002

Mr. Stephen R. Alcorn
Assistant City Attorney
City of Grand Prairie
P.O. Box 534045
Grand Prairie, Texas 75053

OR2002-3085

Dear Mr. Alcorn:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 163988.

The Grand Prairie Police Department (the "department") received a request for information regarding a shooting incident that occurred June 7, 1994, involving a named police officer. You state that offense reports and the case report pertaining to the incident and subsequent prosecution of a criminal suspect have been provided to the requestor. You claim that the officer's use of force report and the internal affairs report are confidential under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. We have considered the provision you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

We first note that the requested information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides in part that

> the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:
>
> > (1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). You state that the requested information pertains to a completed internal affairs investigation. Thus, the city must release this information under section 552.022(a)(1), unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 or expressly confidential under other law.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. You indicate that the City of Grand Prairie is a civil service municipality under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089 of the Local Government Code contemplates two different types of personnel files, one that must be maintained as part of a police officer's civil service file, and one that a city's police department may maintain for its own internal use. *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a), (g). The officer's civil service file must contain certain specified items, including commendations, periodic evaluations by the police officer's supervisor, and documents relating to any misconduct in any instance in which the department took disciplinary action against the officer under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. *Id.* § 143.089(a)(1)-(2). Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. *Id.* §§ 143.051-.055. Information relating to alleged misconduct or disciplinary action taken must be removed from the police officer's civil service file if the police department determines that there is insufficient evidence to sustain the charge of misconduct or that the disciplinary action was taken without just cause. *See id.* § 143.089(b)-(c).

Subsection (g) of section 143.089 authorizes the police department to maintain for its own use a separate and independent internal personnel file relating to a police officer. Section 143.089(g) provides as follows:

> A fire or police department may maintain a personnel file on a fire fighter or police officer employed by the department for the department's use, but the department may not release any information contained in the department file to any agency or person requesting information relating to a fire fighter or police officer. The department shall refer to the director or the director's designee a person or agency that requests information that is maintained in the fire fighter's or police officer's personnel file.

Id. § 143.089(g). In *City of San Antonio v. Texas Attorney General*, 851 S.W.2d 946 (Tex. App.--Austin 1993, writ denied), the court addressed a request for information contained in a police officer's personnel file maintained by the police department for its use and the applicability of section 143.089(g) to that file. The records included in the departmental personnel file related to complaints against the police officer for which no disciplinary action was taken. The court determined that section 143.089(g) made these records confidential. *See City of San Antonio*, 851 S.W.2d at 949 (concluding that "the

legislature intended to deem confidential the information maintained by the . . . police department for its own use under subsection (g)"). The court stated that the provisions of section 143.089 governing the content of the civil service file reflect "a legislative policy against disclosure of unsubstantiated claims of misconduct made against police officers and fire fighters, except with an individual's written consent." *Id.; see also City of San Antonio v. San Antonio Express-News*, 47 S.W.3d 556 (Tex. App. – San Antonio 2000, no pet. h.) (restricting confidentiality under section 143.089(g) to "information reasonably related to a police officer's or fire fighter's employment relationship"); Attorney General Opinion JC-0257 at 6-7 (2000) (addressing functions of section 143.089(a) and (g) files).

You state that the submitted information relates to an investigation conducted by the department's internal affairs division and is maintained by the department as part of the officer's departmental personnel file for departmental use. You inform us that this investigation did not result in a finding of any misconduct on the part of the police officer who was involved in the accident or in any disciplinary action against the officer. Furthermore, we find that in this instance the reports and investigation at issue are reasonably related to the officer's employment relationship. Based on your representations and our review, we determine that the submitted information is confidential under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the

governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



David R. Saldivar
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DRS/sdk

Ref: ID# 163988

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Mary E. Helton
11301 Cezanne Street
Austin, Texas 78726
(w/o enclosures)