



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 25, 2014

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

OR2014-03409

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# 515358 (COSA File No. W021403).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to disciplinary records for a named city police department officer. 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 information.

Initially, we must address the city's procedural obligations under the Act. Section 552.301 of the Government Code prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301. Section 552.301(b) requires that a governmental body 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. *See id.* § 552.301(b). You state the city received the present request for information on November 21, 2013. This office does not count the date the request was received or holidays for the purpose of calculating a governmental body's deadlines under the Act. We note November 28 and 29, 2013 were holidays; thus, the city's ten-business-day deadline was December 9, 2013. However, the city submitted the information required by section 552.301(b) in an envelope meter-marked December 13, 2013. *See id.* § 552.308(a) (prescribing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Consequently, the city failed to comply with section 552.301 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). Generally, a compelling reason to withhold information exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third-party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). You raise section 552.101 of the Government Code, which can provide a compelling reason to withhold information. Accordingly, we will address the applicability of section 552.101 to the submitted information.

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 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 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).¹ *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 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. *Id.* Such records may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089 of the Local

¹Chapter 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).

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 indicate the submitted information is maintained in the city's police department's internal personnel file for the named officer under section 143.089(g). Based on your representation and our review, we agree the submitted information is confidential under section 143.089(g). Accordingly, the city must withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 143.089(g).

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.shtml, 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,



Lindsay E. Hale
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEH/tch

Ref: ID# 515358

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)