



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 29, 2019

Mr. Timothy M. Sampeck
Counsel for the City of Alice
Denton Navarro Rocha Bernal & Zech, P.C.
701 East Harrison, Suite 100
Harlingen, Texas 78550-9165

OR2019-24201

Dear Mr. Sampeck:

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# 783227.

The City of Alice (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for the personnel file of a named city police department employee. You state you have released some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.117, 552.1175, and 552.136 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

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 Exhibit B is contained within the city police department's internal files maintained pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. Based on your representation and our review, we find Exhibit B 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.

We understand you to raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 (“HIPAA”) for some of the remaining information. At the direction of Congress, the Secretary of Health and Human Services (“HHS”) promulgated regulations setting privacy standards for medical records, which HHS issued as the Federal Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information. *See* HIPAA, 42 U.S.C. § 1320d-2 (Supp. IV 1998) (historical & statutory note); Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information, 45 C.F.R. Pts. 160, 164 (“Privacy Rule”); *see also* Attorney General Opinion JC-0508 at 2 (2002). These standards govern the releasability of protected health information by a covered entity. *See* 45 C.F.R. pts. 160, 164. Under these standards, a covered entity may not use or disclose protected health information, excepted as provided by parts 160 and 164 of the Code of Federal Regulations. 45 C.F.R. § 164.502(a).

This office addressed the interplay of the Privacy Rule and the Act in Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004). In that decision, we noted section 164.512 of title 45 of the Code of Federal Regulations provides a covered entity may use or disclose protected health information to the extent such use or disclosure is required by law and the use or disclosure complies with and is limited to the relevant requirements of such law. *See* 45 C.F.R. § 164.512(a)(1). We further noted the Act “is a mandate in Texas law that compels Texas governmental bodies to disclose information to the public.” *See* ORD 681 at 8; *see also* Gov’t Code §§ 552.002, .003, .021. We therefore held the disclosures under the Act come within section 164.512(a). Consequently, the Privacy Rule does not make information confidential for the purpose of section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Abbott v Tex. Dep’t of Mental Health & Mental Retardation*, 212 S.W.3d 648 (Tex. App.—Austin 2006, no pet.); ORD 681 at 9 (2004); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 478 (1987) (as general rule, statutory confidentiality requires express language making information confidential). Because the Privacy Rule does not make confidential information that is subject to disclosure under the Act, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue on that basis.

After reviewing the remaining information, we have determined no novel or complex issue exists in the information at issue. Thus, we address the public applicability of the remaining information in a summary ruling.

The city must withhold the submitted W-4 form under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the MPA. The city must withhold the submitted L-2 and L-3 declaration forms under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1701.306 of the Occupations Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 611.002 of the Health and Safety Code. The city must withhold the employee date of birth under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.¹ The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law

¹ The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

privacy. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the cellular telephone numbers at issue if the cellular telephone services are not paid for by a governmental body. To the extent the information pertains to a currently licensed peace officer and the officer elects to restrict access to his information in accordance with section 552.1175(b) of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.1175 of the Government Code; however, any cellular telephone numbers may only be withheld under section 552.1175 of the Government Code if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular services. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the credit card, bank account, routing, and insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owner of the e-mail address affirmatively consents to its release or subsection (c) applies. The city must release the remaining information.²

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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Ashley Crutchfield
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

AC/mo

Ref: ID# 783227

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

² We note the remaining information 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 under the Act. See Gov't Code § 552.147(b).