



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 22, 2017

Ms. Jo Ann Pate
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
200 Texas Street, 3rd Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-6311

OR2017-05896

Dear Ms. Pate:

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# 649734 (W057915, W057803, W057821, W057822, W057839, W057841, W057842, W057848, W057856, W057857, W057860, W057868, W057870, W057873, W057950, W058144, W057875, W058200, W058208, W058209, W0508210, W058212, W058217, W058228, W058267).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received twenty-five requests from twenty different requestors for information pertaining to a specified incident and a named officer. You state the city has released some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

Initially, you state some of the submitted information is not responsive to the present requests because it does not pertain to the specified incident or the named officer. This ruling does

¹We 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.

not address the public availability of the non-responsive information and the city need not release it in response to these requests.

Next, we note the city has redacted portions of the submitted information pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (“FERPA”). The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office has informed this office FERPA does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act.² See 34 C.F.R. § 99.3 (defining “personally identifiable information”). FERPA governs the availability of student records held by educational institutions or agencies receiving federal funds, and applies only to student records in the custody of educational institutions and to records directly transferred from the educational institution to the third party. *Id.* § 99.33(a)(2). We note the city, which maintains the information at issue, is not an educational institution. See Open Records Decision No. 309 at 3 (1983) (City of Fort Worth not an “educational agency” within FERPA). However, FERPA contains provisions that govern access to education records that an educational agency or institution transfers to a third party. You state the city obtained the information at issue directly from an educational institution. Because our office is prohibited from reviewing these education records to determine the applicability of FERPA, we will not address the applicability of FERPA to any of the submitted records. Such determinations under FERPA must be made by the educational authorities from which education records were obtained. Thus, the city must contact the educational institution from which the information at issue was obtained, as well as the DOE, regarding the applicability of FERPA to the information at issue. To the extent that the information at issue is not governed by FERPA, we will address your arguments against its disclosure.

We also note the submitted information includes city police officers’ body worn camera recordings. Body worn cameras are subject to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code. Chapter 1701 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

²A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General’s website: <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/files/og/20060725usdoe.pdf>

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

Occ. Code § 1701.661(a). In this instance, the requestors do not give the requisite information under section 1701.661(a). As the requestors did not properly request the body worn camera recordings at issue 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).

Next, we must address the city’s obligations under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.301(b) of the Government Code, within ten business days after receiving a written request, the governmental body must request a ruling from this office and state the exceptions to disclosure that apply. Gov’t Code § 552.301(b). We note most of the submitted information is responsive to the first five requests for information. You state the city received the first five requests for information on December 22, 2016. Thus, the city’s ten-business-day deadline under section 552.301 for the first five requests was January 9, 2017.³ However, you did not raise section 552.108 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure until you submitted a second request for ruling on January 11, 2017. *See id.* § 552.308(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Consequently, we find the city failed to comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in raising section 552.108 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body’s failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ). The need of a governmental body, other than the governmental body that failed to timely seek an open records decision, to withhold information under section 552.108 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason sufficient to overcome the presumption of openness. *See* Open Records Decision No. 586 (1991). Because you inform us, and provide documentation showing, the Tarrant County Criminal District Attorney’s Office (the “district attorney’s office”) objects to the release of the information at issue, we will consider whether the city may withhold the submitted information under section 552.108 of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney’s office.

³The city informs us its offices were closed on December 26, 2016, and January 2, 2017 to observe the Christmas and New Year holidays. This office does not count the date the request was received or holidays as business days for the purpose of calculating a governmental body’s deadlines under the Act.

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 made confidential by other statutes, such as section 261.201(a) of the Family Code, which provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under [the Act], and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, audiotapes, videotapes, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). You state the information you have marked was used in an investigation of alleged child abuse or neglect under chapter 261 of the Family Code. *See id.* §§ 101.003(a) (defining “child” for purposes of section 261.201), 261.001(1), (4) (defining “abuse” and “neglect” for purposes of section 261.201 of Family Code). You do not indicate the city has adopted any rules that would permit the release of the responsive information. Accordingly, we find the information at issue is subject to section 261.201 of the Family Code. Therefore, we conclude the information the city has marked is confidential pursuant to section 261.201 of the Family Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.⁴ *See* Open Records Decision No. 440 at 2 (1986) (predecessor statute).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses section 58.007 of the Family Code, which makes confidential juvenile law enforcement records relating to conduct that occurred on or after September 1, 1997. *See* Fam. Code § 58.007(c). Section 58.007 provides, in relevant part, the following:

(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:

⁴As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your remaining arguments against disclosure for the information at issue.

(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 E.

...

(e) Law enforcement records and files concerning a child may be inspected or copied by a juvenile justice agency as that term is defined by Section 58.101, a criminal justice agency as that term is defined by Section 411.082, Government Code, the child, and the child's parent or guardian.

....

(j) Before a child or a child's parent or guardian may inspect or copy a record or file concerning the child under Subsection (e), the custodian of the record or file shall redact:

...

(2) any information that is excepted from required disclosure under [the Act], or other law.

Id. § 58.007(c), (e), (j)(2). 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 at the time of the reported conduct. *See id.* § 51.02(2). We note section 58.007(c) is only applicable to law enforcement records and files of a child. Upon review, we find some of the information you marked is personnel information that does not constitute juvenile law enforcement records for purposes of section 58.007(c). Accordingly, the city may not withhold this information under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 58.007(c). However, we find report number 16-120090 involves alleged juvenile delinquent conduct or conduct indicating a need for supervision that occurred after September 1, 1997. *See id.* §§ 51.02(2) (for purposes of section 58.007(c), "child" means person who is ten years of age or older and under seventeen years of age when conduct occurred), .03(a), (b) (defining "delinquent conduct" and "conduct indicating a need for supervision"). Therefore, report number 16-120090 is confidential under section 58.007(c) of the Family Code. One of the requestors is the legal representative

of the parents of the juvenile offender in the information at issue. Accordingly, pursuant to section 58.007(e) of the Family Code, the city may not withhold the information at issue from this requestor under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground. *See id.* § 58.007(e). Nevertheless, section 58.007(j)(2) provides information subject to any other exception to disclosure under the Act or law must be redacted before a governmental body releases information pursuant to section 58.007(e). *Id.* § 58.007(j)(2). Thus, we will determine whether the city must otherwise withhold the information at issue from this requestor under the Act. However, the remaining requestors do not have access to the information at issue pursuant to section 58.007(e) of the Family Code. Accordingly, the city must withhold report number 16-120090 from these requestors under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code.

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 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 information it has marked is contained only within the city police department's internal files maintained pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. Based on this representation and our review, we find the information at issue 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.⁵

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 release of the requested information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). Section 552.108 may be invoked by any proper custodian of information relating to a pending investigation or prosecution of criminal conduct. *See Open Records Decision No. 474 at 4-5 (1987)*. Where a governmental body has custody of information relating to

⁵As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your remaining arguments against disclosure for the information at issue.

a pending case of a law enforcement agency, the custodian of the records may withhold the information if it provides this office with a demonstration that the information relates to the pending case and a representation from the law enforcement agency that it wishes to have the information withheld.

We note section 552.108 is generally not applicable to the records of an internal affairs investigation that is purely administrative in nature and does not involve the investigation or prosecution of crime. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 at 3-4 (1982). However, the city states the district attorney's office has advised the remaining responsive information relates to an ongoing criminal investigation, and release of that information would interfere with the investigation and prosecution of the case. Based upon 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 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the information at issue. Therefore, the city may withhold the remaining responsive information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office.⁶

In summary, as the requestors did not properly request the body worn camera videos at issue pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code, our ruling does not reach this information, and the city need not release the submitted body camera videos at issue in response to these requests for information. The city must withhold the information it has marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. The city must withhold the information pertaining to report number 16-120090 from all requestors, other than the legal representative of the parents of the juvenile offender at issue, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.007(c) of the Family Code. The city must withhold the information it has marked under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code in conjunction with section 552.101 of the Government Code. The city may withhold the remaining responsive information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code on behalf of the district attorney's office.

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.

⁶As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your remaining arguments against disclosure for the information at issue.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kaelan A. Henze". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Kaelan A. Henze
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAH/eb

Ref: ID# 649734

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)