



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 27, 2017

Ms. Linda Pemberton
Paralegal
Office of the City Attorney
P.O. Box 1329
Killeen, Texas 76540-1329

OR2017-22163

Dear Ms. Pemberton:

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# 677787 (Ref. No. W022837).

The City of Killeen (the "city") received a request for specified types of agreements between city employees and the city, including such agreements between named individuals and the city. You state you have released the requested agreement between one of the named individuals and the city. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the city has not submitted any information pertaining to the named individuals. To the extent information responsive to this portion of the request existed on the date the city received the request, we assume you have released it. *See* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible). If you have not released any such information, you must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302.

Next, we note some of the requested information may have been the subject of previous rulings from this office. We have no indication the law, facts, or circumstances upon which the prior rulings were based have changed. Accordingly, to the extent the requested

information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon, the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter Nos. 2011-19064 (2011), 2012-08861 (2012), 2013-03899 (2013), 2014-01710 (2014), and 2014-06417 (2014) as previous determinations, and withhold or release the previously ruled upon information in accordance with them. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in a prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). However, to the extent the information in the current request is not encompassed by the prior rulings, we will consider the exception you raise.

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)-(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).

You state the submitted information is maintained in the city police department's internal personnel file for the officers at issue under section 143.089(g). However, we note the submitted information relates to misconduct that resulted in disciplinary action pursuant to section 143.089. Thus, while the information at issue may be kept in the internal file maintained under section 143.089(g), it must also be kept in the civil service personnel file maintained under section 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 sections 143.089(a) and 143.089(g); therefore, the request encompasses both of these files. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted information pertaining to the suspensions under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 143.089(g). Thus, the city must release the submitted information. *See id.* § 143.089(f); ORD 562 at 6.

In summary, to the extent the requested information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon, the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter Nos. 2011-19064 (2011), 2012-08861 (2012), 2013-03899 (2013), 2014-01710 (2014), and

2014-06417 (2014) as previous determinations, and withhold or release the previously ruled upon information in accordance with them. The city must release the submitted 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, 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 'Meredith L. Coffman', with a long, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/tdw

Ref: ID# 677787

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)