



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 2, 2007

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

OR2007-01355

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# 270379.

The City of League City (the "city") received a request for the personnel file of a named city police officer.¹ You state that some of the requested information will be provided to the requestor, with redactions pursuant to section 552.147 of the Government Code, as well as the previous determination issued by this office in Open Records Decision No. 670 (2001).²

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, 552.136, 552.137,

¹As you have not submitted the request for information, we take our description from your brief.

²See 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).

and 552.140 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³

Initially, we must address the city's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code. Section 552.301(e) requires the governmental body to submit to the attorney general, not later than the fifteenth business day after the date of its receipt of the request, (1) written comments stating why the governmental body's claimed exceptions apply to the information that it seeks to withhold; (2) a copy of the written request for information; (3) a signed statement of the date on which the governmental body received the request, or evidence sufficient to establish that date; and (4) the specific information that the governmental body seeks to withhold or representative samples of the information if it is voluminous. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A)-(D). In this case, you have not submitted to this office a copy of the written request for information. Consequently, the city failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Generally, a governmental body may demonstrate a compelling reason to withhold information by a showing that the information is made confidential by another source of law or affects third-party interests. *See* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). The city's claim under section 552.122 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects the governmental body's interests and may be waived by the governmental body. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). As such, section 552.122 does not constitute "other law" that makes information confidential. However, your claims under sections 552.101, 552.114, 552.115, 552.117, 552.119, 552.130, 552.136, 552.137, and 552.140 can provide compelling reasons for non-disclosure under section 552.302. Accordingly, we will consider these claimed exceptions against disclosure.

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

³We 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 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).⁴ *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 3 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.⁵

⁴Chapter 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.

⁵As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address your remaining arguments for this information.

We now turn to the information in Exhibits 1 and 2, which you state is also maintained in the officer's civil service file. 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. This office has found that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses is protected under common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps).

Common-law privacy also encompasses certain types of personal financial information. This office has determined that financial information that relates only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first element of the common-law privacy test, but the public has a legitimate interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. See Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9-12 (1992) (identifying public and private portions of certain state personnel records), 545 at 4 (1990) (attorney general has found kinds of financial information not excepted from public disclosure by common-law privacy to generally be those regarding receipt of governmental funds or debts owed to governmental entities), 523 at 4 (1989) (noting distinction under common-law privacy between confidential background financial information furnished to public body about individual and basic facts regarding particular financial transaction between individual and public body), 373 at 4 (1983) (determination of whether public's interest in obtaining personal financial information is sufficient to justify its disclosure must be made on case-by-case basis). Upon review, we find that the personal financial information the city has marked in Exhibit 1 is protected under common-law privacy. We therefore determine that the city must withhold this marked information pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Next, you assert that the remaining information that you have highlighted in Exhibit 1 is subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(2) excepts from disclosure the home address, home telephone number, social security number, and family member information of a peace officer, regardless of whether the officer made an election under section 552.024 or 552.1175.⁶ See Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2); Open Records Decision No. 622 (1994). Based on our review, we find that the city must withhold the remaining information you have highlighted Exhibit 1 pertaining to the named peace officer pursuant to section 552.117(a)(2).

⁶"Peace Officer" is defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

You claim that the e-mail addresses you have highlighted in Exhibit 2 are subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code. This section 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 id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). We find that the e-mail addresses you have highlighted are not of the type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Therefore, unless the individuals at issue consented to the release of their e-mail addresses, the city must withhold them in accordance with section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold Exhibit 3 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. The personal financial information marked in Exhibit 1 must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must also withhold the highlighted information pertaining to the named peace officer in Exhibit 1 pursuant to section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the e-mail addresses in Exhibit 2 under section 552.137 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,



Gilbert N. Saenz
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

GNS/sdk

Ref: ID# 270379

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Michael O'Toole
310 Quaker
Friendswood, Texas 77546
(w/o enclosures)