



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

January 3, 2011

Mr. Mark G. Mann  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Garland  
P.O. Box 469002  
Garland, Texas 75046-9002

OR2011-00061

Dear Mr. Mann:

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# 404580 (GCA 10-0777).

The Garland Police Department (the "department") received a request for all complaints and disciplinary actions against six named officers, the "complete identity" of the six named officers, and all information related to a specified incident involving the requestor's client. You state you made redactions pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).<sup>1</sup> You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information, some of which is a representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

Initially, we note section 552.022 of the Government Code is applicable to some of the submitted information. Section 552.022(a)(1) provides for required public disclosure of "a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body[.]" unless the information is expressly confidential under other law or excepted from

---

<sup>1</sup>We note Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including Texas driver's license numbers under section 552.130 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

<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.

disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Section 552.022(a)(17) provides that information filed with a court is generally a matter of public record that cannot be withheld from disclosure. *Id.* § 552.022(a)(17); *Star-Telegram, Inc. v. Walker*, 834 S.W.2d 54 (Tex. 1992). In this instance, the submitted information includes completed internal affairs investigations subject to section 552.022(a)(1) and court-filed documents that are subject to section 552.022(a)(17). Although you raise section 552.103 of the Government Code for the internal affairs investigations and the court-filed documents, section 552.103 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; *Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 (1999) (governmental body may waive section 552.103). As such, section 552.103 is not "other law" that makes information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, the department may not withhold the completed investigations or court-filed documents under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, we will address the applicability of section 552.103 and your remaining arguments to the remaining submitted information that is not subject to section 552.022. Additionally, because information subject to section 552.022 may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code, we will consider whether any of the information subject to section 552.022 may be excepted from disclosure under that section.

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 section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. You state the City of Garland (the "city") is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089 provides for the existence of two different types of personnel files relating to a police officer: one that must be maintained as part of the officer's civil service file and another the police department may maintain for its own internal use. *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a), (g). Under section 143.089(a), 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 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; *see* Attorney General Opinion JC-0257 (written reprimand is not disciplinary action for purposes of Local Gov't Code chapter 143). 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.<sup>3</sup> *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).

However, a document relating to a police officer's alleged misconduct may not be placed in his civil service 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 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 state a portion of the submitted information is contained in the department's internal personnel files for the named officers under section 143.089(g). Based on your representations and our review, we agree the information you have indicated consists of internal affairs investigative records that did not result in disciplinary actions. Therefore, the information you have indicated is confidential under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code.

We note a portion of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(17) is subject to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. Section 261.201 of the Family Code provides in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act] and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under

---

<sup>3</sup>We note that section 143.089(g) requires a police department that receives a request for information maintained in a file under section 143.089(g) to refer that person to the civil service director or the director's designee. You state you have forwarded the request to the city's civil service commission.

this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

...

(k) Notwithstanding Subsection (a), an investigating agency, other than the department or the Texas Youth Commission, on request, shall provide to the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of a child who is the subject of reported abuse or neglect, or to the child if the child is at least 18 years of age, information concerning the reported abuse or neglect that would otherwise be confidential under this section. The investigating agency shall withhold information under this subsection if the parent, managing conservator, or other legal representative of the child requesting the information is alleged to have committed the abuse or neglect.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a), (k). Upon review, we find the information we have marked was used or developed in an investigation of abuse under chapter 261 of the Family Code. *See id.* § 261.001(1) (defining "abuse" for purposes of Fam. Code ch. 261); *see also id.* § 101.003(a) (defining "child" for purposes of this section as person under 18 years of age who is not and has not been married or who has not had the disabilities of minority removed for general purposes). In this instance, the requestor is an attorney representing a parent of the child victim listed in the information. However, the information reflects this parent is suspected of having committed the alleged abuse. Accordingly, we conclude none of the exceptions in subsection (k) apply to this report. *See id.* § 261.201(k) (parental exception to section 261.201(a) inapplicable where parent alleged to have committed abuse/neglect at issue). Therefore, the information we have marked is confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code, and the department must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

Next, we note some of the remaining information consists of a medical record. Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Medical Practices Act (the "MPA"). Occ. Code §§ 151.001-165.160. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in part:

(a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

*Id.* § 159.002(a)-(c). This office has concluded the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). We also have determined that when a file is created as the result of a hospital stay, all of the documents in the file relating to the diagnosis and treatment constitute either physician-patient communications or records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that are created or maintained by a physician. *See* Open Records Decision No. 546 (1990). Further, medical records must be released on the patient's signed, written consent, provided that the consent specifies (1) the information to be covered by the release, (2) reasons or purposes for the release, and (3) the person to whom the information is to be released. *Id.* §§ 159.004, .005.

Although you claim the medical record is excepted under section 552.103 of the Government Code, the MPA's specific right of access provision prevails over the Act's general exceptions to disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision No. 451 at 4 (1986) (specific statutory right of access provision overcome general exceptions to disclosure under statutory predecessor to Act). In this instance, the requestor may have a right of access to his client's medical record. *See id.* §§ 159.004, .005. Thus, the medical record we have marked may only be released in accordance with the MPA.

We now address your argument under section 552.103 of the Government Code for the information not subject to section 552.022. Section 552.103 provides in part the following:

(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). A governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documentation sufficient to establish the applicability of this exception to the information at issue. To do so, the governmental body must demonstrate (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to the pending or anticipated litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *See Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).*

Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986).* To demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *Id.* 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. *See Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); see also 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).* We also note that the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).*

You state the department received a letter, which you have submitted for our review, from the requestor stating that he represents an individual in his claim for use of excessive force against the City of Garland and the department. You further state the department maintains this letter is "notice of litigation" for purposes of section 552.103. Based on your representations and our review, we find the department reasonably anticipated litigation on the date the request was received. We also find that the submitted information is related to the anticipated litigation. We therefore conclude that the department may withhold the remaining information not subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup>

In summary, the department must withhold the information you have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family

---

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

Code. The department may only release the marked medical records in accordance with the MPA. The department may withhold the remaining information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.<sup>5</sup>

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Andrea L. Caldwell  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ALC/eeg

Ref: ID# 404580

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>5</sup>As you acknowledge, the information being released contains information to which the requestor has a special right of access under section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (person has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and is protected from public disclosure by law intended to protect person's privacy interests); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual asks governmental body to provide her information concerning herself). If the department receives another request for this particular information from a different requestor, then the department should again seek a decision from this office.