



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 25, 2020

Ms. Erin Ham  
Deputy City Clerk  
City of Wichita Falls  
P.O. Box 1431  
Wichita Falls, Texas 76307

OR2020-16509

Dear Ms. Ham:

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# 832976 (ORR# 366).

The City of Wichita Falls (the "city") received a request for eight points of information regarding the requestor's client; all policies and orders regarding a specified topic; any complaints, discipline, internal affairs investigations, or use of force reports regarding the specified topic; and any administrative investigation files or communications pertaining to discipline of police officers for specified reasons.<sup>1</sup> You state the city released some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides, in relevant part:

---

<sup>1</sup> You state the city sent the requestor a cost estimate of charges pursuant to section 552.2615 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.2615. The estimate of charges required the requestor to provide a deposit for payment of anticipated costs under section 552.263 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.263(a). You inform us the city received the required payment on April 16, 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 governmental body receives bond or deposit).

<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.

(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). Exhibit 5 contains Use of Force Summary Reports and Exhibit 6 consists of a completed internal affairs investigation that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). This information must be released 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.* Although you assert the information subject to section 552.022 is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code, this section is discretionary and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision No. 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, none of the information subject to section 552.022 may be withheld under section 552.103. However, as section 552.101 of the Government Code makes information confidential under the Act, we will consider the applicability of this section for the information subject to section 552.022. Additionally, we will consider your 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 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 relating to a police officer: 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). 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; *see, e.g.*, Attorney General Opinion JC-0257 (2000) (written reprimand is not disciplinary action for purposes of Local Government 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. *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.* § 143.089(g). 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 submitted information is contained within the internal files of the city’s police department (the “department”) maintained pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. You inform us some of the information at issue relates to investigations that did not result in disciplinary actions against the officers at issue. 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 department’s internal files pursuant to section 143.089(g), the

requestor does not have a right of access to her client's records under section 143.089(e). Based upon your representations and our review, we find the city may generally withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

However, the confidentiality provided by section 143.089(g) may not be engrafted on information that exists independently of a file maintained under section 143.089(g). As previously stated, the submitted information includes Use of Force Summary Reports. You do not state, and we are unable to determine, whether the Use of Force Summary Reports are maintained solely in the department's section 143.089(g) files. Accordingly, we must rule conditionally. To the extent the Use of Force Summary Reports, which we marked, are maintained solely in the department's section 143.089(g) files, this information is confidential under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code. However, to the extent the Use of Force Summary Reports also exist independently of the department's section 143.089(g) files, they are not confidential under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code and may not be withheld 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. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. The court of appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). Accordingly, to the extent the Use of Force Summary Reports exist independently of the department's section 143.089(g) files, the city must withhold the public citizens' dates of birth within the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city may generally withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. However, to the extent the Use of Force Summary Reports exist independently of the department's section 143.089(g) files, the city must withhold the public citizens' dates of birth within the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open->

---

<sup>3</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

[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,

James M. Graham  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JMG/rm

Ref: ID# 832976

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)