



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 29, 2014

Mr. Charles H. Weir
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2014-01694

Dear Mr. Weir:

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# 512109 (COSA File No. W014199).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for the personnel file of a named officer and information regarding a specified case. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information contains a peace officer's Texas Commission on Law Enforcement Officer Standards and Education ("TCLEOSE") identification number. In Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990), this office determined certain computer information, such as source codes, documentation information, and other computer programming, that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information made public under section 552.021 of the Government Code. We understand an officer's TCLEOSE identification number is a unique computer-generated number assigned to peace officers for identification in the commissioner's electronic database, and may be used as an access device number on the TCLEOSE website. Accordingly, we find the officer's TCLEOSE identification number in the submitted information does not constitute public information

under section 552.002 of the Government Code. Therefore, the officer's TCLEOSE identification number is not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor.¹

Next, we must address the city's obligation under section 552.301(b) of the Government Code, which requires a governmental body to ask for a decision from this office and state which exceptions apply to the requested information by the tenth business day after receiving the request. Gov't Code § 552.301(b). The city received the request for information on March 20, 2013. Thus, the ten-business-day deadline to request a decision from this office was April 3, 2013. However, you did not submit a request for a ruling to our office until November 8, 2013. Thus, we find the city failed to comply with section 552.301(b) of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption the requested information is public and must be released unless a compelling reason exists to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *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); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). This statutory presumption can generally be overcome when information is confidential by law or third-party interests are at stake. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 3, 325 at 2 (1982). You claim the information in Exhibit 3 is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code, which is a discretionary exception that may be waived. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). Because you failed to comply with section 552.301, you have waived your claims under section 552.108. However, the interests under section 552.108 of a governmental body other than the one that failed to comply with section 552.301 can provide a compelling reason for non-disclosure under section 552.302. *See* Open Records Decision No. 586 at 2-3 (1991). You inform us, and provide a letter stating, the Bexar County Criminal District Attorney's Office (the "district attorney's office") asserts the information at issue should be withheld under section 552.108 of the Government Code. Therefore, we will consider whether the information at issue may be withheld on behalf of the district attorney's office under section 552.108. You also claim the information in Exhibit 2 is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Because section 552.101 can provide a compelling reason for non-disclosure, we will consider the applicability of this exception to the information at issue.

¹As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your argument against the disclosure of this information.

Next, we note some of information in Exhibit 3 consists of court-filed documents. A document that has been filed with a court is expressly public under section 552.022 of the Government Code and may not be withheld unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). As noted above, section 552.108 is a discretionary exception to disclosure, which protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* ORDs 665 at 2 n.5, 177 at 3. As such, section 552.108 does not make information confidential for purposes of section 552.022(a)(17). Thus, the city may not withhold the court-filed documents we have marked in Exhibit 3 under section 552.108 of the Government Code. As no further exceptions for this information are raised, it must be released.

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 excepts from disclosure information deemed confidential by statute, such as section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. You state the 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 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 any instance in which the police department took disciplinary action against the officer under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. *See id.* § 143.089(a)(1)-(3). Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. *See 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). *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 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 the 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 section 143.089(g) made the records confidential. See *City of San Antonio*, 851 S.W.2d at 949; see also *City of San Antonio v. San Antonio Express-News*, 47 S.W.3d 556 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2000, pet. denied) (restricting confidentiality under Local Gov't Code § 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 Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a) and (g) files).

You state the information in Exhibit 2 is maintained in the internal files of the city's police department pursuant to subsection 143.089(g). We note a portion of the information at issue, which we have marked, consists of a periodic evaluation of the officer at issue. While this information may be kept in the internal file maintained under section 143.089(g), it must also be kept in the civil service personnel file maintained under section 143.089(a). See Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a)(3). The request for information was received by the city, which has access to the files maintained under both section 143.089(a) and section 143.089(g). Therefore, the request encompasses both of these files. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the marked periodic evaluation under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code, and it must be released to the requestor. However, we find the remaining information in Exhibit 2 is confidential under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code and the city must withhold it from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground.

Section 552.108(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the

detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(a); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). Section 552.108 may be invoked by the proper custodian of information relating to a pending investigation or prosecution of criminal conduct. *See Open Records Decision No. 474 at 4-5 (1987)*. Where a governmental body has custody of information relating to a pending case of a law enforcement agency, the custodian of the records may withhold the information if it provides this office with a demonstration that the information relates to the pending case and a representation from the law enforcement agency that it wishes to have the information withheld. You inform this office, and provide documentation reflecting, the district attorney’s office objects to release of the information at issue because release would interfere with a pending criminal investigation and prosecution. Based upon this representation, we conclude the release of the remaining information in Exhibit 3 would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ’g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Accordingly, the city may generally withhold the remaining information in Exhibit 3 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code, on behalf of the district attorney’s office.

We note, however, that the remaining information in Exhibit 3 includes a DIC-24 statutory warning and a DIC-25 notice of suspension. The city’s police department provided copies of these forms to the arrestee. You have not explained how releasing this information, which has already been seen by the arrestee, would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1)*. Accordingly, the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms may not be withheld under section 552.108.

Additionally, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure “basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.” *Id.* § 552.108(c). Section 552.108(c) refers to the basic “front-page” information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-187; *see also Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976)* (summarizing types of information considered to be basic information). Accordingly, with the exception of the DIC-24 and DIC-25 forms and basic information, the city may withhold the remaining information in Exhibit 3 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the officer’s TCLEOSE identification number is not subject to the Act. The city must release the court-filed documents we marked in Exhibit 3 pursuant to section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. With the exception of the marked periodic evaluation in Exhibit 2, which must be released, the city must withhold the remaining information in Exhibit 2 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. With the exception of the DIC-24 and

DIC-25 forms and basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold the remaining information in Exhibit 3 under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.²

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtm, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Kristi L. Wilkins
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KLW/bhf

Ref: ID# 512109

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

²We note the information being released includes the requestor's client's driver's license information, to which the requestor has a right of access pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect person's privacy interests); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(d), (e). Thus, if the city receives another request for this information from a person who does not have such a right of access, section 552.130(c) authorizes the city to redact the requestor's client's driver's license information.