



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 17, 2016

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

OR2016-11292

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# 610378 (Fort Worth PIR# W049777).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for a specified police report and the internal affairs investigation related to that report. 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.

The submitted information contains body-worn camera recordings. These recordings are subject to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, which provides the procedures a requestor must follow when seeking a body-worn camera recording. Section 1701.661(a) provides:

A member of the public is required to provide the following information when submitting a written request to a law enforcement agency for information recorded by a body worn camera:

- (1) the date and approximate time of the recording;
- (2) the specific location where the recording occurred; and

(3) the name of one or more persons known to be a subject of the recording.

Occ. Code § 1701.661(a). The requestor has not provided the required information under section 1701.661(a) of the Occupations Code. As the requestor did not properly request the body-worn camera recordings pursuant to chapter 1701, our ruling does not reach this information and it need not be released. However, pursuant to section 1701.661(b), a “failure to provide all the information required by Subsection (a) to be part of a request for recorded information does not preclude the requestor from making a future request for the same recorded information.” *Id.* § 1701.661(b).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. You state the City of Fort Worth is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089 provides for the existence of two different types of personnel files relating to a police officer: 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 which the department took disciplinary action against the officer under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. *Id.* §143.089(a)(1)–(2). 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 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). However, a document relating to a police officer’s alleged misconduct may not be placed in his civil service file if there is insufficient evidence to sustain the charge of misconduct. Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(b). Information that reasonably relates to a police 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.¹ *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. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 851 S.W.2d 946, 949 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied).

You state the submitted information is maintained in the city police department's internal personnel files under section 143.089(g). You state the submitted information pertains to an investigation into allegations of misconduct of police officers that did not result in disciplinary action. We note, however, you have submitted a copy of the specified police report. You state this report is maintained by the city independently of any officer's personnel file. The city may not engraft the confidentiality afforded to records under section 143.089(g) to records that exist independently of the internal files. Accordingly, the city may not withhold that report based on section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. However, the city 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, and we must address the applicability of common-law privacy to the information within the police report.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. In considering whether a member of the public'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.² *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 members of the public, and thus, dates of birth of members of the public are also protected by common-law privacy under section 552.101 of the Government Code. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3. Accordingly, the city must withhold all dates of birth of members of the public under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

¹Although section 143.089(e) provides police officers a right of access to their own civil service file maintained under section 143.089(a), this office has determined police officers and their authorized representatives do not have a right to their own internal files maintained by a police department pursuant to section 143.089(g). *See* Open Records Decision No. 650 at 3 (1996) (confidentiality provision of section 143.089(g) contains no exceptions).


²Section 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).

In summary, with the exception of the specified report, the city must withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. As to the police report, the city must withhold all dates of birth of members of the public under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must release the remaining information within the police report.

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,



Neal Falgoust
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NF/eb

Ref: ID# 610378

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)