



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 5, 2006

Mr. Albert Lopez  
Law Offices of Albert Lopez  
14310 Northbrook Drive, Suite 110  
San Antonio, Texas 78232

OR2006-05865

Dear Mr. Lopez:

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# 250645.

The Laredo Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for (1) a copy of any and all records that pertain to complaints of sexual harassment and/or sexual assault filed against any and all police officers working with the department since November 30, 2005, and (2) the name and address of every female that filed a complaint since November 30, 2005. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that some of the submitted information appears to have been obtained pursuant to a grand jury subpoena. The judiciary is expressly excluded from the requirements of the Act. *See* Gov't Code § 552.003(1)(B). This office has determined that a grand jury, for purposes of the Act, is a part of the judiciary and therefore not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 411 (1984). Further, records kept by another person or entity acting as an agent for a grand jury are considered to be records in the constructive possession of the grand jury and therefore are not subject to the Act. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 513 (1988), 411 (1984), 398 (1983); *but see* Open Records Decision No. 513 at 4 (1988) (defining limits of judiciary exclusion). The fact that information collected or prepared by another person or entity is submitted to the grand jury does not necessarily mean that such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession when the same information is also held in the other person's or entity's own capacity. Information held by another person or entity but not produced at the direction of the grand jury may well be protected under one of the Act's specific exceptions to disclosure, but such information is not excluded from the reach of the Act by the judiciary exclusion. *See* Open Records

Decision No. 513 (1988). Therefore, to the extent that the information at issue is held by the department as an agent of the grand jury, such information is in the grand jury's constructive possession and is not subject to disclosure under the Act. The rest of this decision is not applicable to such information. To the extent that the information at issue is not held by the department as an agent of the grand jury, so as to be subject to the Act, we consider it with the remaining submitted information.

Next, we note that some of the requested information appears to be subject to a previous ruling issued by the office. On February 22, 2006, this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2006-01731 (2006). We presume that the pertinent facts and circumstances have not changed since the issuance of this prior ruling. Thus, we determine that the department must continue to rely on our ruling in Open Records Letter No. 2006-01731 with respect to any information requested in that instance that is also at issue here. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (governmental body may rely on previous determination when the records or information at issue are precisely the same records or information that were previously submitted to this office pursuant to section 552.301(e)(1)(D); the governmental body which received the request for the records or information is the same governmental body that previously requested and received a ruling from the attorney general; the prior ruling concluded that the precise records or information are or are not excepted from disclosure under the Act; and the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have not changed since the issuance of the ruling). To the extent the requested information was not addressed in Open Records Letter No. 2006-01731, we will address your claim for exception.

Next, we address your claim that the present request requires the department to "compile a particular individual's criminal history information[.]" Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from required public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, the governmental body must meet both prongs of this test. *Id.* at 681-82. A compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). In this instance, however, the requestor has not asked the department to compile any particular individual's criminal history. Rather, the requestor merely seeks records pertaining to all complaints of sexual harassment and/or sexual assault filed against any department officer during a specified time period. We conclude, therefore, that no individual's common-law right to privacy is implicated in this instance. Consequently, none

of the submitted information is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.101 also encompasses information protected by other statutes. You state that the City of Laredo 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 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 an officer's misconduct and takes disciplinary action against the 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 officer's civil service file maintained under section 143.089(a). *Abbott v. 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.* at 120, 122. Such records are subject to release under the Act. *See* Local Gov't Code § 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. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 851 S.W.2d 946, 949 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied).

You indicate that the submitted information is maintained in the department's internal file pursuant to section 143.089(g). Further, as this information relates to pending investigations that have not concluded, we understand that none of the information relates to investigations that have resulted in disciplinary action being taken against any of the officers. We therefore conclude that this information is confidential pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code and must be withheld under section 552.101.

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 cursive script that reads "Shelli Egger". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned to the right of the typed name.

Shelli Egger  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

SE/sdk

Ref: ID# 250645

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Sharon E. Naill  
Post Office Box 440800  
Laredo, Texas 78044  
(w/o enclosures)