



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 2, 2019

Ms. Katie Leininger  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Pearland  
3519 Liberty Drive  
Pearland, Texas 77581

OR2019-27649

Dear Ms. Leininger:

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# 789067.

The City of Pearland (the "city") received a request for eight categories of information regarding the city's police department, including use of force incidents, officer-involved shootings, a copy of the policy manual, and certain complaints. You state the city does not have some information responsive to a portion of the request.<sup>1</sup> You state you have released some 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.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

<sup>2</sup> We assume 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.

Initially, you state the city sought clarification from the requestor for part of the request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed). You inform us the city has yet to receive a response to the request for clarification. We note a governmental body has a duty to make a good-faith effort to relate a request for information to information the governmental body holds. Open Records Decision No. 561 (1990). In this instance, the city has submitted information it believes is responsive to the request and made arguments against disclosure of this information. Thus, we assume the city has made a good-faith effort to relate the request to information it holds. However, the city has no obligation at this time to release any additional responsive information for which it has not received clarification. If the requestor responds to the request for clarification, the city must seek a ruling from this office before withholding any additional responsive information from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b); *City of Dallas*, 304 S.W.3d at 387.

Section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information concerning an investigation that concluded in a result other than conviction or deferred adjudication. Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). You state Exhibit C concerns a concluded investigation that did not result in a conviction or deferred adjudication. Based on this representation, we agree section 552.108(a)(2) is applicable to the submitted information.

However, we note section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. *Id.* § 552.108(c). Basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). *See also* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing the types of information considered to be basic information). Thus, with the exception of basic information, the city may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code.

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 section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. We understand the city is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089 provides for the existence of two different types of personnel files relating to a police officer: one that must be maintained as part of the officer's civil service file and another the police department may maintain for its own

internal use. *See* Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a), (g). 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 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; *see* Attorney General Opinion JC-0257 (written reprimand is not disciplinary action for purposes of Local Gov't Code chapter 143).

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.<sup>3</sup> *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). However, information maintained in a police department's internal file pursuant to section 143.089(g) is confidential and must not be released. *City of San Antonio v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 851 S.W.2d 946, 949 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied).

You state Exhibit D is held in files maintained by the city's police department (the "department") under section 143.089(g). Upon review, we agree the information maintained in the department's internal files is confidential under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code, and, therefore, Exhibit D must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

In summary, with the exception of basic information, which must be released, the city may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.108(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must withhold Exhibit D under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Britni Ramirez". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Britni Ramirez  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BR/gw

Ref: ID# 789067

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)