



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 5, 2006

Ms. Kathleen P. Barina
Deputy City Attorney
City of Temple
Legal Department
2 North Main Street, Suite 306
Temple, Texas 76501

OR2006-11658

Dear Ms. Barina:

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# 261173.

The City of Temple (the "city") received a request for seventeen categories of information relating to a named police officer. Although you state that the city has released some responsive information, you claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information that another statute makes confidential. You claim that the submitted information is confidential under section 552.101

¹ Although you initially raised sections 552.102, 552.107, 552.108, 552.115, 552.117, 552.1175, and 552.132 of the Government Code, you have not provided any arguments in support of these claims. Thus, the city has waived its claims under sections 552.107, 552.108, and 552.115. See Gov't Code § 552.301(e) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions in general). Further, the city has not demonstrated that any of the submitted information is confidential for purposes of sections 552.102, 552.117, 552.1175, or 552.132. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

in conjunction with section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089 provides for the existence of two different types of personnel files relating to a police officer, including one that must be maintained as part of the officer's civil service file and another that the 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.

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). *See 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 are in the 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 may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(f); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 6 (1990). 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* Local Gov't Code § 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 those 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.) (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). Based on your representations and our review of the information at issue, we agree that portions of the submitted information, which we have marked, must be withheld from the requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. We note that the submitted information includes commendations that must also be held in the officer's civil service file under section 143.089(a). *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a)(1)-(2). Thus, these commendations cannot be withheld from disclosure under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code.

You state, however, that most of the submitted information relates to misconduct that resulted in a disciplinary action, and you inform us that the officer at issue is now appealing that disciplinary action. Although you contend that this information must be maintained only in the police department's confidential internal personnel file created under section 143.089(g) because of the pending appeal, we note that an officer's civil service file must contain documents relating to any misconduct in those cases where the police department took disciplinary action against the officer. *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a)(2); *see also* Local Gov't Code §§ 143.051-143.055 (describing "disciplinary action" for purposes of section 143.089(a)(2)); Attorney General Opinion JC-0257 (2000). We note section 143.089(c) provides that information that must be placed in a civil service file under section 143.089(a)(2) may be removed if the civil service commission determines that (1) the disciplinary action was taken without just cause or (2) the charge of misconduct was not supported by sufficient evidence. *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(c). Section 143.089(c) therefore signifies that complaint files resulting in disciplinary action must be placed in the civil service file during the pendency of the appeal. The information at issue relates to the misconduct that resulted in disciplinary action against the officer. Therefore, this information must be maintained in the civil service file pursuant to section 143.089(a)(2), and thus it may not be withheld in response to the request for information made to the city under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code.

In the alternative, you claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Governmental Code,² which provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The city has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The city must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under 552.103(a). To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982).

² While you do not cite to a section of the Government Code for this exception to disclosure, we understand you to raise section 552.103 of the Government Code. You explain that the submitted information should "be withheld because the [c]ity believes a lawsuit to be reasonably anticipated." Section 552.103 of the Government Code is the proper exception for the substance of your argument.

You inform us that the officer at issue has been suspended. You also inform us that the officer has made a request for an appeal before a third party hearing examiner to challenge his suspension. We note that municipal civil service appeals, such as the one requested here by the named officer, are governed by chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. *See* Local Gov't Code §§ 143.057, 143.127-143.131. This office has determined that such appeal proceedings constitute litigation for purposes of section 552.103. *Cf.* Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991). As such, we conclude that litigation involving the city was pending on the date it received the request for information. We also find that a portion of the submitted information, which we have marked, is related to the pending litigation. The city has failed to explain how any portion of the remaining information at issue relates to the pending litigation. Therefore, section 552.103 of the Government Code applies to the information we have marked.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103 interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103, and it must be disclosed. In this instance, some of the information at issue has been provided to the named officer who is the opposing party in the pending litigation; this information may therefore not be withheld under section 552.103. You may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 to the extent it has not been provided to the opposing party in the pending litigation. We also note that the applicability of section 552.103 ends once the litigation has been concluded.

We note that the remaining documents contain information that is confidential by law. Section 552.101 also encompasses the common-law right of privacy, which protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. In addition, this office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy: an individual's criminal history when compiled by a governmental body, personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990), some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, and identities of victims of sexual abuse. Upon review, we find that a portion of the remaining information, which we have marked, is protected by common-law privacy and must be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

We note that the remaining submitted information contains an e-mail address that is excepted from disclosure under section 552.137 of the Government Code. Section 552.137 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 we have marked is not of the type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Therefore, in accordance with section 552.137, the city must withhold the marked e-mail address unless the city receives consent to release it.

In summary, pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the marked information in conjunction with section 143.089 of the Local Government Code, and common-law privacy. With the exception of any information that has been previously provided to the opposing party, the city may withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code. Finally, the city must withhold the marked e-mail address pursuant to section 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

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,



Amy L.S. Shipp
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ALS/sdk

Ref: ID# 261173

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Michael J. Magana
Attorney at Law
P.O. Box 5120
Temple, Texas 76505-5120
(w/o enclosures)