



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 22, 2016

Mr. Norman Ray Giles
Counsel for the City of Santa Fe
Chamberlain, Hrdlicka, White, Williams & Aughtry, P.P.C.
1200 Smith Street, Suite 1400
Houston, Texas 77002

OR2016-09090

Dear Mr. Giles:

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# 606860.

The City of Santa Fe (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from different requestors for the first requestor's personnel file. The city states it has released some information. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the city claims and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

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. We understand 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). Both sections refer to "police officer." We note the first requestor was hired by the city's police department as a probationary officer. Section 143.003 defines a police officer as a member of a police department or other peace officer who was appointed

¹We assume 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 those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

in substantial compliance with chapter 143 or who is entitled to civil service status under other sections of chapter 143. *Id.* § 143.003(5). We understand the individual at issue was appointed in substantial compliance with chapter 143. Therefore, we agree the individual at issue was a “police officer” subject to chapter 143. 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. 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. 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).

The city states the submitted information is contained within the city’s police department’s internal files maintained pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code.² Based on these representations and our review, we find the submitted information 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.³

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,



Rahat Huq
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RSH/bhf

²We note although 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).

³As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the city’s remaining arguments against disclosure.

Ref: ID# 606860

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)