



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 8, 2016

Ms. Judith S. Rawls
Assistant City Attorney
Beaumont Police Department
P.O. Box 3827
Beaumont, Texas 77704-3827

OR2016-20306

Dear Ms. Rawls:

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# 628235 (ORR# 07-17).

The City of Beaumont (the "city") received a request for the requestor's records from the city and the city police department. You state the city has released some responsive information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.108, 552.1175, 552.130, and 552.147 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed 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 the civil service director is required to maintain, and an internal file the police department may maintain for its own use. Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a), (g). The officer's

¹Although you do not raise sections 552.1175, 552.130, and 552.147 of the Government Code in your brief, we understand you to raise these exceptions based on your markings.

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 police 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).² *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 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.³ *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).

²Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. Local Gov't Code §§ 143.051-.055.

³Although 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).

You assert Exhibit B is excepted from disclosure under section 143.089(g). You state the information at issue is maintained exclusively in the city police department's internal files pursuant to section 143.089(g). Furthermore, you state this information relates to incidents in which no disciplinary action was taken. Based on your representations and our review, we find Exhibit B is confidential pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.⁴

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). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the information at issue 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, 710 (Tex. 1977). You state Exhibit D relates to a pending criminal investigation or prosecution. Based on this representation, we conclude the release of the information at issue 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, 186-87 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (delineating law enforcement interests present in active cases), *writ ref’d n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Therefore, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to this information.

However, section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. Gov’t Code § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle*. *See* 531 S.W.2d at 186-88; Open Records Decision No. 127 at 3-4 (1976) (summarizing types of information deemed public by *Houston Chronicle*). Thus, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold Exhibit D under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.⁵

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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your other arguments to withhold this information.

⁵As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your other arguments to withhold this information, except to note that basic information may generally not be withheld from public disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 597 (1991).

No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find the information you have marked consists of the requestor's private information, to which he has a special right of access under section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(b) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on grounds that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code on this basis.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code 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). We understand you to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which is discussed above. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court expressly disagreed with *Hubert's* interpretation of section 552.102(a), and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The supreme court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 348. Upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

In summary, the city must withhold Exhibit B under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. With the exception of basic information, the city may withhold Exhibit D under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.⁶

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/>

⁶We note the requestor has a special right of access to some of the information being released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(b); ORD 481 at 4. Thus, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, then the city must again seek a decision from this office.

[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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "B. Berger". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letter of each name being significantly larger and more stylized.

Brian E. Berger
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BB/akg

Ref: ID# 628235

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)