



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 14, 2006

Mr. Leonard V. Schneider  
Ross, Banks, May, Cron & Cavin, P.C.  
2 Riverway, Suite 700  
Houston, Texas 77056-1918

OR2006-14684

Dear Mr. Schneider:

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# 266772.

The League City Police Department (the "department") received a request for the personnel file of a named city police officer. You state that some of the requested information has been released to the requestor with social security numbers redacted. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b) (governmental body may redact social security number from public release without necessity of requesting decision from this office under the Act). You also state that some of the information from the officer's civil service file maintained by the City of League City (the "city") pursuant to section 143.089(a) of the Local Government Code will be provided to the requestor, with portions of the information redacted pursuant to a previous determination issued by this office in Open Records Decision No. 670 (2001).<sup>1</sup> You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.114, 552.115, 552.117, 552.119, 552.122, 552.130, 552.552.136, 552.137, and 552.140 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>*See* Open Records Decision No. 670 at 6 (2001) (authorizing all governmental bodies that are subject to the Act to withhold home addresses and telephone numbers, personal cellular telephone numbers, personal pager numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of peace officers without the necessity of requesting attorney general decision under section 552.117(a)(2); *see also* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (delineating circumstances under which attorney general decision constitutes previous determination under section 552.301).

<sup>2</sup>We assume that 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 that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes, such as section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. You inform us that League City is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089 contemplates two different types of personnel files, a police officer’s civil service file that a city’s civil service director is required to maintain, and an internal file that the police department may maintain for its own use. Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(a), (g).

In cases in which a police department investigates a police officer’s misconduct and takes disciplinary action against an officer, it is required by section 143.089(a)(2) to place all investigatory records relating to the investigation and disciplinary action, including background documents such as complaints, witness statements, and documents of like nature from individuals who were not in a supervisory capacity, in the police officer’s civil service file maintained under section 143.089(a).<sup>3</sup> *Abbott v. City of Corpus Christi*, 109 S.W.3d 113, 122 (Tex. App.—Austin 2003, no pet.). All investigatory materials in a case resulting in disciplinary action are “from the employing department” when they are held by or in possession of the department because of its investigation into a police officer’s misconduct, and the department must forward them to the civil service commission for placement in the civil service personnel file. *Id.* Such records are subject to release under the Act. *See id.* § 143.089(f); *Open Records Decision No. 562* at 6 (1990).

However, a document relating to a police officer’s alleged misconduct may not be placed in his civil service personnel file if there is insufficient evidence to sustain the charge of misconduct. Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(b). Information that reasonably relates to a police officer’s employment relationship with the police department and that is maintained in a police department’s internal file pursuant to section 143.089(g) is confidential and must not be released. *City of San Antonio v. San Antonio Express-News*, 47 S.W.3d 556 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2000, pet. denied); *City of San Antonio v. Tex. Attorney General*, 851 S.W.2d 946, 949 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied).

You inform us that the information submitted as Exhibit 2 is maintained in the police department’s internal files concerning the officer at issue, and that these investigations did not result in disciplinary action. Based on your representations and our review of the records at issue, we agree that this information is confidential pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. *See* Local Gov’t Code §§ 143.051-.055. A letter of reprimand does not constitute discipline under chapter 143.

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address your remaining arguments for this information.

We now address your arguments regarding the civil service file, submitted as Exhibit 1. You raise section 552.130 of the Government Code for portions of Exhibit 1. Section 552.130 provides in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from the requirement of Section 552.021 if the information relates to:

(1) a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state; [or]

(2) a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state[.]

Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1), (2). Upon review, we conclude that the Texas motor vehicle record information that we have marked must be withheld under section 552.130.

In summary, the department must withhold Exhibit 2 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. The Texas motor vehicle record information we have marked in Exhibit 1 must be withheld under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information at issue must be released.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Dep't of Pub. 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Lisa V. Cubriel  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LVC/eb

Ref: ID# 266772

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Reagan M. Edwards  
2000 Smith Street  
Houston, Texas 77002  
(w/o enclosures)