



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 31, 2006

Mr. Steven M. Kean
Deputy City Attorney
City of Tyler
P. O. Box 2039
Tyler, Texas 75710

OR2006-01001

Dear Mr. Kean:

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# 241355.

The City of Tyler (the "city") received a request for eight categories of information regarding a named police officer. You inform us that the city does not maintain some of the requested information¹ and that you have released some of the requested information. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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, such as section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. You state that the 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 the civil service director is required to maintain, and an

¹The Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received, nor does it require a governmental body to prepare new information in response to a request. *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); Open Records Decision Nos. 452 at 2-3 (1986), 342 at 3 (1982), 87 (1975); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 572 at 1 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 416 at 5 (1984).

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). *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.* Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. See Local Gov't Code §§ 143.051-143.055. Such records are subject to release under chapter 552 of the Government Code. See *id.* § 143.089(f); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 6 (1990). However, information 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. Texas Attorney Gen.*, 851 S.W.2d 946, 949 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied).

You inform us that the requestor seeks a summary list of all complaints and disciplinary actions involving the named officer and their resolutions. You also inform us that such a summary is contained in an “Integrity Unit Report” which the department created in order to maintain and provide a summary of the information contained in the Tyler Police Department's internal affairs files. You represent that the Integrity Unit Report is maintained in the Tyler Police Department's internal files in accordance with section 143.089(g). Based on your representations, we conclude that the Integrity Unit Report is confidential under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code and must therefore be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Turning to the remaining information, section 552.108(a) excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime.” Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. See Gov't Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); see also *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You state that the submitted dispatch records relate to a pending criminal investigation. However, the dispatch records reveal virtually no information about the underlying investigation that would not be released as part of basic information. See Gov't Code § 552.108(c) (stating that basic information may not be withheld under section 552.108); Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). As the city has failed to explain how release of the dispatch record would interfere with the

detection, investigation or prosecution of crime, the city may not withhold the dispatch record under section 552.108, and it must be released.

You also state that the submitted video relates to a pending criminal investigation. Based upon this representation, we conclude that the release of the video would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. See *Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases). Thus the city may withhold the video from disclosure based on section 552.108(a)(1). The city has the discretion to release all or part of the video that is not otherwise confidential by law. Gov't Code § 552.007.

In summary, the Integrity Unit Report is confidential under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code and must therefore be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the video from disclosure based on section 552.108(a)(1). The dispatch records 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "José Vela III". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "José" and the last name "Vela" being more prominent.

José Vela III
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JV/krl

Ref: ID# 241355

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Larry McDougal
1000 A Austin St.
Richmond, Texas 77469
(w/o enclosures)