



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 18, 2015

Mr. Guillermo Trevino
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
1000 Throckmorton Street, 3rd Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2015-17147

Dear Mr. Trevino:

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# 575840 (Fort Worth PIR No. W043037).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for the personnel files of two named city police officers. You state you have released some information to the requestor. You state you have redacted information pursuant to section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code in accordance with Open Records Decision No. 670 (2001), certain information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), and social security numbers under section 552.147(b) of the Government Code.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.130, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

¹Open Records Decision No. 670 authorizes all governmental bodies to withhold the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, personal cellular telephone and pager numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of peace officers under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. ORD 670 at 6. Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* ORD 684. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

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. Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by 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 provides for the maintenance of two different types of personnel files for each police officer employed by a civil service city: one that must be maintained as part of the officer’s civil service file and another that 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 any instance in which the police department took disciplinary action against the officer under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. *Id.* § 143.089(a)(1)-(3). Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. *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). *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 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 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).

Section 143.089(g) authorizes a police department to maintain, for its own use, a separate and independent internal personnel file relating to a police officer. *See id.* § 143.089(g). 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. 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 that 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 these 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 submitted as Exhibit C-2 is contained within the city police department's internal files maintained pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. Additionally, you explain, and the information at issue reflects, the internal affairs investigation in Exhibit C-2 resulted in a determination the allegations were unfounded or the investigation did not result in disciplinary action. Based on your representation and our review, we find Exhibit C-2 is confidential under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code and must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 143.090 of the Local Government Code. As noted above, you state the city is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.090 provides as follows:

A department, [the Fire Fighters' and Police Officers' Civil Service Commission], or municipality may not release a photograph that depicts a police officer unless:

- (1) the officer has been charged with an offense by indictment or by information;
- (2) the officer is a party in a civil service hearing or a case before a hearing examiner or in arbitration;
- (3) the photograph is introduced as evidence in a judicial proceeding;
or
- (4) the officer gives written consent to the release of the photograph.

Local Gov't Code § 143.090. You state the information you have marked in Exhibit C-3 consists of photographs that depict a police officer. You inform us the police officer depicted in the submitted photographs has not provided the city with written consent regarding the release of the photographs. You further inform us none of the remaining exceptions under section 143.090 are applicable. Therefore, the city must withhold the information you have marked in Exhibit C-3 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.090 of the Local Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code, which provides the following:

(a) A polygraph examiner, trainee, or employee of a polygraph examiner, or a person for whom a polygraph examination is conducted or an employee of the person, may not disclose information acquired from a polygraph examination to another person other than:

- (1) the examinee or any other person specifically designated in writing by the examinee;
- (2) the person that requested the examination;
- (3) a member, or the member's agent, of a governmental agency that licenses a polygraph examiner or supervises or controls a polygraph examiner's activities;
- (4) another polygraph examiner in private consultation; or
- (5) any other person required by due process of law.

(b) The [Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation] or any other governmental agency that acquires information from a polygraph examination under this section shall maintain the confidentiality of the information.

(c) A polygraph examiner to whom information acquired from a polygraph examination is disclosed under Subsection (a)(4) may not disclose the information except as provided by this section.

Occ. Code § 1703.306. The remaining information contains polygraph information that is confidential under section 1703.306, and the requestor does not appear to have a right of access to the information under that section. Accordingly, with the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code. However, we find none of the remaining information consists of polygraph information that is confidential under section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code

and none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code, which governs the public availability of mental health records and provides:

(a) Communications between a patient and a professional, and records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient that are created or maintained by a professional, are confidential.

(b) Confidential communications or records may not be disclosed except as provided by Section 611.004 or 611.0045.

Health & Safety Code § 611.002(a)-(b); *see id.* § 611.001 (defining “patient” and “professional”). Upon review, we find the information we marked under section 611.002 consists of mental health records. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code.²

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the Medical Practice Act (“MPA”), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code, which governs release of medical records. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides, in relevant 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.

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

Occ. Code § 159.002(a)-(c). Information subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See id.* §§ 159.002, .004. 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). Upon review, we find the information you have marked in the remaining information, as well as the additional information we have marked, constitute records of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that were created or are maintained by a physician. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information you have marked in the remaining information, and the additional information we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA.³

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 411.192 of the Government Code, which governs the release of information maintained by the Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) concerning the licensure of an individual to carry a concealed handgun. Section 411.192 provides, in part:

(a) [DPS] shall disclose to a criminal justice agency information contained in its files and records regarding whether a named individual or any individual named in a specified list is licensed under this subchapter. Information on an individual subject to disclosure under this section includes the individual’s name, date of birth, gender, race, zip code, telephone number, e-mail address, and Internet website address. Except as otherwise provided by this section and by Section 411.193, all other records maintained under this subchapter are confidential and are not subject to mandatory disclosure under the open records law, Chapter 552.

(b) An applicant or license holder may be furnished a copy of disclosable records regarding the applicant or license holder on request and the payment of a reasonable fee.

Gov’t Code § 411.192(a)-(b). We have marked information that is subject to section 411.192. In this instance, the requestor is neither the license holder nor a criminal justice agency. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.192 of the Government Code. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information at issue is subject to section 411.192. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.101 on that basis.

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has found a compilation of an individual's criminal history is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. U.S. Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. However, we note criminal history information obtained by a law enforcement agency in the process of hiring a peace officer is a matter of legitimate public interest. We also note the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 542 (1990), 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees), 432 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow). This office has also found personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (public employee's withholding allowance certificate, designation of beneficiary of employee's retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and employee's decisions regarding voluntary benefits programs, among others, protected under common-law privacy), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). However, information concerning financial transactions between an employee and a public employer is generally of legitimate public interest. ORD 545. We note the payroll deductions for federal withholding tax are protected by common-law privacy and must be withheld under section 552.101, but the payroll deductions for social security, mandatory retirement, and Medicare are not protected by common-law privacy and may not be withheld under section 552.101. *See, e.g.*, ORDs 600 at 9-12 (participation in TexFlex), 545 at 3-5; *see also* Attorney General Opinion GA-0572 at 4 (2007) (public employee's net salary protected by common-law privacy, but gross salary is not). We further note information obtained by a law enforcement agency in the process of hiring a peace officer is a matter of legitimate public interest, and the public has a legitimate interest in information relating to those who are involved in law enforcement. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 470 at 4 (1987) (job performance does not generally constitute public employee's

private affairs), 473 at 3 (1987) (fact that public employee received less than perfect or even very bad evaluation not private), 444 at 3 (1986) (public has obvious interest in information concerning qualifications and performance of law enforcement employees), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee's job was performed cannot be said to be of minimal public interest). Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). We note dates of birth of members of the public are generally not highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 7 (1987) (home addresses, telephone numbers, dates of birth not protected under privacy).

Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must generally withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. It is not clear whether the listed payroll deductions and benefits reflect mandatory participation by the employee or are the employee's voluntary financial decisions. Thus, to the extent this information reflects the employee's voluntary allocation of salary to optional investment, retirement, or other financial programs offered by the city, the city must withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, to the extent the information at issue reflects the employee's mandatory participation in the city's retirement program or benefits paid by the city, the deduction amounts are not confidential and may not be withheld on that basis. However, we find none of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Although you reference *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061 (Tex. App. — Austin May 22, 2015, pet. filed) (mem. op.), we note a petition for review was filed with the Texas Supreme Court on July 29, 2015. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Thus, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information you have marked, as well as the additional information we have marked, in the remaining information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code 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). *Id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). Accordingly, the city must withhold the e-mail addresses you have marked, as well as the e-mail addresses we have marked, under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the addresses affirmatively consent to their release.

In summary, the city must withhold the information in Exhibit C-2 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. The city must withhold the information you have marked in Exhibit C-3 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.090 of the Local Government Code. With the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code. The city must withhold the information you have marked, as well as the information we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 411.192 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; however, the payroll information we have marked may only be withheld if it reflects the employee's voluntary allocation of salary to optional investment, retirement, and other financial programs offered by the city. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information you have marked, as well as the information we have marked, under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the e-mail addresses you have marked, as well as the e-mail addresses we have marked, under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the addresses affirmatively consent to their release. The city must release the remaining information.

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,



Abigail T. Adams
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ATA/akg

Ref: ID# 575840

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)