



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 27, 2020

Ms. Captoria Brown  
Senior Paralegal  
Ms. Jessica Farrias  
Records Coordinator  
City of Carrollton  
1945 East Jackson Road  
Carrollton, Texas 75006

OR2020-11874

Dear Ms. Brown and Ms. Farrias:

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# 824248 (City ID# W018843-020420).

The City of Carrollton (the "city") received a request for (1) the requestor's personnel file, including a specified internal affairs investigation, and (2) communications between named individuals containing specified keywords during a specified time period.<sup>1</sup> You state you will release some information upon payment of costs. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.111 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> After receiving the request, the city sent the requestor an estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.2615. The estimate of charges required to requestor to provide a deposit for payment of anticipated costs under section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.263(a). The city submits documentation showing it received the deposit on March 1, 2020. *See id.* § 552.263(e) (if governmental body requires deposit or bond for anticipated costs pursuant to section 552.263, request for information is considered to have been received on date that governmental body receives deposit or bond).

<sup>2</sup> Although the city also raises section 552.108 of the Government Code, it makes no arguments to support this exception. Therefore, we assume the city has withdrawn its claim this section applies to the submitted information.

<sup>3</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

Initially, we note you have submitted documents that do not consist of either category of information. Thus, this information, which we have marked and indicated, is not responsive to the present request. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the city is not required to release that information in response to this request.<sup>4</sup>

Next, we note some of the responsive information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides, in relevant part, as follows:

(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 responsive information includes a completed investigation that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release this information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* The city seeks to withhold this information, which we marked, under the deliberative process privilege of section 552.111 of the Government Code. We note section 552.111 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 470 at 7 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 subject to waiver).* Therefore, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, because section 552.101 of the Government Code makes information confidential under the Act, we will consider the city's arguments under section 552.101 for the information subject to section 552.022. We will also consider the city's remaining arguments for the information not subject to section 552.022.

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 other statutes. As part of the Texas Homeland Security Act ("HSA"), sections 418.176 through 418.182 were added to chapter 418 of the Government Code. These provisions make confidential certain information related to terrorism. Section 418.177 of the HSA provides that information is confidential if it:

---

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.

<sup>4</sup> As we are able to make this determination, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

(1) is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity for the purpose of preventing, detecting, or investigating an act of terrorism or related criminal activity; and

(2) relates to an assessment by or for a governmental entity, or an assessment that is maintained by a governmental entity, of the risk or vulnerability of persons or property, including critical infrastructure, to an act of terrorism or related criminal activity.

*Id.* § 418.177. The fact that information may relate to a governmental body's security concerns does not make the information *per se* confidential under the HSA. See Open Records Decision No. 649 at 3 (1996) (language of confidentiality provision controls scope of its protection). Furthermore, the mere recitation by a governmental body of a statute's key terms is not sufficient to demonstrate the applicability of a claimed provision. As with any exception to disclosure, a governmental body asserting one of the confidentiality provisions of the HSA must adequately explain how the responsive records fall within the scope of the claimed provision. See Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must explain how claimed exception to disclosure applies). Upon review, we find the city failed to demonstrate any of the responsive information is confidential under section 418.177. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the responsive information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that basis.

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. Upon review, we find the city has failed to demonstrate any of the responsive information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the responsive information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]" Gov't Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. See Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. See *Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of

the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body's policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body's policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body's policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995). Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events that are severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); *see* ORD 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

The city seeks to withhold the remaining responsive information under section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, upon review, we find the city has failed to demonstrate the information at issue consists of internal communications containing advice, opinions, or recommendations on the policymaking matters of the city. Accordingly, the remaining responsive information may not be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. You indicate 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 police 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. *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; *see* Attorney General Opinion JC-0257 (2000) (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 in possession of the city because of its investigation into a police officer's misconduct, and the city 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 the 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 (addressing functions of Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a) and (g) files).

You state the responsive information is contained in the personnel file of the requestor. We note that, although section 143.089(e) provides police officers a right of access to their own civil service files maintained under section 143.089(a), this office has determined police officers do not have a right of access to their own internal files maintained by a police department pursuant to section 143.089(g). *See* Open Records Decision No. 650 at 3 (1996) (confidentiality provision of section 143.089(g) contains no exceptions). Thus, because some of the records at issue are maintained in the city police department's internal file pursuant to section 143.089(g), the requestor does not have a right of access to his records under section 143.089(e). Based upon your representations and our review, we conclude the city must withhold some of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. However, we note some of the information consists of documents relating to misconduct that resulted in disciplinary action against the requestor. While this information 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)(1), (3). In this instance, the request was received by the city, which has access to 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 information maintained in the section 143.089(a) file under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code.

In summary, the city must release the completed investigation, which we marked, pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. The city must release the remaining responsive 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 <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,

Kimbell Kesling  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KK/rm

Ref: ID# 824248

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)