



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 11, 2013

Ms. Linda Pemberton
Paralegal
City of Killeen
P.O. Box 1329
Killeen, Texas 76540-1329

OR2013-02347

Dear Ms. Pemberton:

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# 478602 (Killeen ID# W009426).

The Killeen Police Department (the "department") received a request for (1) the requestor's personnel file; (2) copies of any complaints, concerns, allegations, grievances, memorandum, letters, e-mails, computer exams/analysis or documents regarding allegations against the requestor; (3) information provided to or received from any governmental agency regarding allegations against the requestor; (4) records of two specified internal affairs investigations; and (5) records relied upon to support two specified letters of reprimand. You state the department has released some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹ We have also received and considered comments submitted by the requestor. See Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit written comments regarding why information should or should not be released).

¹This letter ruling assumes that the submitted representative sample of information is truly representative of the requested information as a whole. This ruling does not reach, and therefore does not authorize, the withholding of any other requested information to the extent that the other information is substantially different than that submitted to this office. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D), .302; Open Records Decision Nos. 499 at 6 (1988), 497 at 4 (1988).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” *Id.* § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes such as section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. You state the department operates under the civil service law in chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089 contemplates two different types of personnel files relating to a police officer: 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). 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)-(3).

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.). Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. Local Gov’t Code §§ 143.051-.055; *see, e.g.*, Attorney General Opinion JC-0257 (2000) (written reprimand is not disciplinary action for purposes of Local Government Code chapter 143). 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 police department because of its investigation into a police officer’s misconduct, and the police department must forward them to the civil service commission for placement in the civil service personnel file. *Abbott*, 109 S.W.3d at 122. 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 an 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). In addition, a document relating to disciplinary action against a police officer that has been placed in the officer’s personnel file as provided by section 143.089(a)(2) must be removed from the officer’s file if the civil service commission finds the disciplinary action was taken without just cause or the charge of misconduct was not supported by sufficient evidence. *See id.* § 143.089(c). Information that reasonably relates to an 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. *See 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. Texas Attorney General, 851 S.W.2d 946, 949 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied).

You state the submitted information is contained in a personnel file regarding the requestor the department maintains pursuant to section 143.089(g). We note the submitted information includes a completed periodic performance evaluation of the requestor. This type of information is subject to section 143.089(a) and must be placed in the officer's civil service file, unless the department has already done so.² See Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a)(1)-(3). Based on your representations and our review, we conclude the submitted information is generally confidential under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code.

We note, however, the requestor is the officer to whom the submitted information pertains and the information includes the requestor's fingerprints. The public availability of the requestor's fingerprints is governed by chapter 560 of the Government Code. Section 560.003 states "[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under [the Act]." Gov't Code § 560.003; see *id.* § 560.001(1) ("biometric identifier" means retina or iris scan, fingerprint, voiceprint, or record of hand or face geometry). Section 560.002 provides, however, that "[a] governmental body that possesses a biometric identifier of an individual . . . may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose the biometric identifier to another person unless . . . the individual consents to the disclosure[.]" *Id.* § 560.002(1)(A). Thus, the requestor has a right of access to his fingerprints pursuant to section 560.002. See Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself).

In this instance, the department seeks to withhold the requestor's fingerprints on the basis of section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. Thus, we must address the conflict between the requestor's right of access under section 560.002 of the Government Code and the confidentiality provided by section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. When information falls within both a general and a specific statutory provision, the specific provision prevails over the general provision, unless the general provision was enacted later and there is clear evidence the legislature intended for the general provision to prevail. See Gov't Code § 311.026 (where general statutory provision conflicts with specific provision, specific provision prevails as exception to general provision); *Cuellar v. State*, 521 S.W.2d 277 (Tex. Crim. App. 1975) (under well-established rule of statutory construction, specific statutory provisions prevail over general ones); Open Records Decision Nos. 598, 583 (1990), 451 (1986). Section 560.002 of the Government Code is a more specific statute than section 143.089(g) because section 560.002 applies specifically to fingerprints, while section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code is generally applicable to records in a personnel file. Thus, the requestor's fingerprints are governed by

²Section 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. Regardless of your statement that failure to do so was to minimize delay, the department must refer the requestor to the director of human resources, who you inform us is also the civil service director.

section 560.002 of the Government Code and must be released to him on this basis. The department must withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code.

In summary, the requestor's fingerprints must be released to him pursuant to section 560.002 of the Government Code.³ The department must withhold the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code.

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, 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,



Lindsay E. Hale
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEH/tch

Ref: ID# 478602

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

³Because the information being released in this instance is confidential with respect to the general public, the department must again seek a ruling from this office if it receives another request for this information from a different individual. See Gov't Code § 560.002(1)(A).