



KEN PAXTON  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 9, 2017

Mr. Matthew Murray  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
200 Texas Street, Third Floor  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2017-18041

Dear Mr. Murray:

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# 670001 (PIR No. W061963).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for the personnel file of a named city police officer. You state the city is releasing most of the requested information. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.117 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

The submitted information includes 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 provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) 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;

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you do not raise section 552.117 of the Government Code in your brief, we understand you to claim this exception based on your markings in the submitted information.

- (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). In this instance, the requestor does not give the requisite information under section 1701.661(a). As the requestor 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).

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.

*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* 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 assert Exhibit C1 is maintained in the city's police department's internal personnel file for the named officer under section 143.089(g). You state the information at issue relates to internal affairs investigations that did not result in disciplinary actions against the named officer. Based on your representations and our review, we find the information at issue is confidential under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. Accordingly, the city must withhold Exhibit C1 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, and social security number of a peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. We have marked information under section 552.117 that consists of the personal information of peace officers who are or were employed by the city and the information is held in an employment context. In this instance, however, it is unclear whether the individuals whose information is at issue are currently licensed peace officers

as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Accordingly, to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue are currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue are no longer licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12, then the city may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(2). Further, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is subject to section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government code, and it may not be withheld on that basis.

If the information we marked under section 552.117 pertains to individuals who are no longer licensed peace officers, then the marked information may be subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) 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 of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *Id.* § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Therefore, to the extent the individuals at issue are no longer licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12 and to the extent the individuals timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the individuals at issue are no longer licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12 or did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1). Further, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government code, and it may not be withheld on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses 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 demonstrated. *See 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 No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find the information we marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must generally withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we note the information we marked pertains to an individual whose identity may be protected under section 552.117 of the Government Code.

In that instance, the information at issue relates to an individual who has been de-identified and whose privacy interest is thus protected, and the city may not withhold that information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. Further, we find none of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing information and of no legitimate public interest, and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, pursuant to section 1701.661 of the Occupations Code, the submitted body camera recordings at issue were not properly requested pursuant to chapter 1701 of the Occupations Code and need not be released to this requestor in response to this request for information. The city must withhold Exhibit C1 under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. To the extent the individuals whose information is at issue are currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. To the extent the individuals at issue are no longer licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure and to the extent the individuals timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. To the extent the information we marked pertains to an individual who has not been de-identified, 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 release the remaining information.

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](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,



Paige Thompson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PT/eb

Ref: ID# 670001

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)