



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 7, 2017

Ms. Amy L. Sims
Deputy City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of Lubbock
P.O. Box 2000
Lubbock, Texas 79457

OR2017-07313

Dear Ms. Sims:

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# 652670 (ORR Nos. 1520 & 1522).

The City of Lubbock (the "city") received two requests from different requestors seeking information regarding a named officer of the city's police department (the "department"). You state the city is withholding certain information pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).¹ You state the city will release some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.117, 552.1175, and 552.136 of the Government Code.² We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

¹Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

²Although you also raise section 552.108 of the Government Code, you have not provided any arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we assume you have withdrawn your claim this section applies to the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we have marked, is not responsive to either of the requests for information because it consists of one of the requests for information or was created after the city received the requests for information. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983). This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the requests and the city is not required to release such information in response to the requests.

Next, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The information submitted as Exhibits C and C-1 includes completed investigations and a completed report that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). In addition, the information submitted as Exhibit D contains completed evaluations that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the completed investigations, report, and evaluations, which we have marked and noted, pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless they are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Further, the responsive information submitted as Exhibit C-1 contains court-filed documents that are subject to section 552.022(a)(17). This information, which we have marked, must be released unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(17). You seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, section 552.103 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive Gov't Code § 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the information subject to section 552.022 may not be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, as sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, 552.1175, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code make information confidential, we will consider the applicability of these exceptions to the information subject to

section 552.022.³ We will also consider your argument under section 552.103 for the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in relevant part as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a).

You argue the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code is protected in its entirety by section 552.103 of the Government Code. The city states, and provides documentation showing, a lawsuit styled *Shaun A. Harris v. City of Lubbock and Officer Hugh Glen Osborn*, Cause No, 5:17-CV-00010-C, was filed and pending against the city in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Texas, when the city received the request for information. Therefore, we agree litigation to which the city was a party was pending when the city received the request. We also find the information at issue is related to the pending litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). Therefore, the city

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

may withhold the responsive information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which we have marked and noted, under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code.

However, once the information has been obtained by all parties to the pending litigation, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision No. 349 at 2 (1982). We also note the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends when the litigation has concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 at 2 (1982); Open Records Decision Nos. 350 at 3 (1982), 349 at 2.

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 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)-(2). Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. *Id.* §§ 143.051-.055. A letter of reprimand does not constitute discipline under chapter 143. *See* Attorney General Opinion JC-0257. 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.

Local Gov't Code § 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* 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).

You claim the information in Exhibits C and C-1 subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code is confidential pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. You state the information in Exhibit C is maintained in the department's internal personnel file for the named officer under section 143.089(g). Although you state the internal affairs investigations did not result in disciplinary actions against the named officer, upon review, we find several of the internal affairs cases in Exhibit C, which we have noted, pertain to allegations of misconduct that ultimately resulted in disciplinary action. Accordingly, while these cases may be kept in the internal file maintained under subsection 143.089(g), they must also be kept in the civil service personnel file maintained under subsection 143.089(a). *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a)(2). In this instance, the request was received by the city, which has access to the files maintained under both subsections 143.089(a) and 143.089(g); therefore, the requests encompass both of these files. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the internal affairs cases we noted under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. Based on your representation that the remaining information in Exhibit C did not result in disciplinary action, we find the remaining information at issue is confidential under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

You inform us Exhibit C-1 “contains information directly related to and identifying [section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code] file information.” However, you inform us the information in Exhibit C-1 “is not directly included in the officer’s official internal affairs file (the [section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code] 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. Thus, the information in Exhibit C-1, which is maintained independently of the department’s internal investigative files, is not confidential under section 143.089(g) and the city may not withhold any portion of Exhibit C-1 under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis. We will therefore consider your additional arguments against disclosure with respect to this information, as well as against release of the internal affairs cases we noted in Exhibit C.

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). The Texas Supreme Court held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Accordingly, the city must withhold the employees’ dates of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government 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. The doctrine of common-law privacy protects a compilation of an individual’s criminal history, which is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. United States Dep’t of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual’s privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one’s criminal history). Furthermore, we find a compilation of a private citizen’s criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 545 (1990) (common-law privacy protects mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports,

financial statements, and other personal financial information). The Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See 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.). Thus, the [GB] must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Upon review, we find some of the remaining information, which we have marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1)*. You argue some of the remaining information is confidential pursuant to section 552.117 of the Government Code. Upon review, however, we find the remaining information does not contain the home address, telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, or family member information of a current or former employee of the city. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.1175 of the Government Code provides in part:

(a) This section applies only to:

(1) peace officers as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure[.]

(b) Information that relates to the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, or social security number of an individual to whom this section applies, or that reveals whether the individual has family members is confidential and may not be disclosed to the public under this chapter if the individual to whom the information relates:

(1) chooses to restrict public access to the information; and

(2) notifies the governmental body of the individual's choice on a form provided by the governmental body, accompanied by evidence of the individual's status.

Id. § 552.1175(a)(1), (b). You argue some of the remaining information contains “certain requested identifying information of a peace officer.” Upon review, we find the remaining information does not contain the home address, telephone number, emergency contact information, date of birth, social security number, or family member information of a peace officer. Thus, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.1175 of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s license, driver’s license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See id.* § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” *Id.* § 552.136(b). Section 552.136(a) defines “access device” as “a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to . . . obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value [or] initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.” *Id.* § 552.136(a). Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated the remaining information contains access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city may withhold the responsive information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which we marked and noted, under section 552.103(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we noted in Exhibit C under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. The city must withhold the employees’ dates of birth we marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.⁴

⁴The information being released contains social security numbers. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person’s social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See Gov’t Code* § 552.147(b).

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,



Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/som

Ref: ID# 652670

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)