



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 30, 2015

Mr. James Kopp
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2015-22837

Dear Mr. Kopp:

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# 585148 (COSA File#s W030233, W066818).

The San Antonio Police Department (the "department") received a request for all dates and incidents from the department's use-of-force database for a specified time period.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.³ We have also considered comments

¹We note the governmental body sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request).

²The department failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code; however, section 552.101 is a mandatory exception that constitutes a compelling reason to withhold information sufficient to overcome the presumption of openness cause by a failure to comply with section 552.301. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.007, .301, .302, .352. Accordingly, we will consider the department's arguments under section 552.101.

³We 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.

submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not 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. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. You state the City of San Antonio 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 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; *see* Attorney General Opinion JC-0257 (2000) (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. *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. § 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 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 (addressing functions of Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a) and (g) files).

You assert the submitted information is maintained in personnel files of department employees maintained pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. However, the court in *City of San Antonio v. San Antonio Express-News* addressed the applicability of section 143.089 to the department's use-of-force database, noting the information in the database is "administrative in nature, as opposed to personnel-related." 47 S.W.3d at 565. Thus, the court concluded regardless of whether the use-of-force database information is kept in an officer's personnel file, the information may not be withheld on the basis of section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code because the information is "not any more reasonably related to an individual officer's employment relationship with the department than an 'offense report' completed by the same officer detailing the same incident." *Id.* Accordingly, the submitted use-of-force database information is not confidential pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code, and the department may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 658 (1998), 478 (1987)* (stating that statutory confidentiality must be express and will not be implied from statutory scheme). Accordingly, we will address the department's remaining arguments.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 58.007 of the Family Code. Juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997, are confidential under section 58.007(c). Section 58.007 provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

(c) Except as provided by Subsection (d), law enforcement records and files concerning a child and information stored, by electronic means or otherwise, concerning the child from which a record or file could be generated may not be disclosed to the public and shall be:

(1) if maintained on paper or microfilm, kept separate from adult files and records;

(2) if maintained electronically in the same computer system as records or files relating to adults, be accessible under controls that are separate and distinct from controls to access electronic data concerning adults: and

(3) maintained on a local basis only and not sent to a central state or federal depository, except as provided by Subchapters B, D, and H.

Fam. Code § 58.007(c). For purposes of section 58.007(c), “child” means a person who is ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age when the conduct occurred. *See id.* § 51.02(2). We note section 58.007(c) is only applicable to law enforcement records. However, the submitted use-of-force database information is an administrative record. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007 of the Family Code.

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. In considering whether a public citizen’s date of birth is private, the Third Court of Appeals looked to the supreme court’s rationale in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of Texas*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). The supreme court concluded public employees’ dates of birth are private under section 552.102 of the Government Code because the employees’ privacy interest substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in disclosure.⁴ *Tex. Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Texas Comptroller*, the court of appeals concluded the privacy rights of public employees apply equally to public

⁴Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a).

citizens, and thus, public citizens' dates of birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3. Thus, the department must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find the remaining information you have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the department also must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the department must withhold the public citizens' dates of birth and the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, and 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,



Ramsey A. Abarca
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RAA/dls

Ref: ID# 585148

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)