



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 6, 2020

Ms. Roxana I. Perez Stevens
Counsel for the City of Kyle
The Knight Law Firm, LLP
223 West Anderson Lane, Suite A-105
Austin, Texas 78752

OR2020-25151

Dear Ms. Perez Stevens:

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# 847221 (Ref. No. W007229-070920).

The City of Kyle (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information related to complaints against the city's police chief.¹ You claim some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. You also claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered your arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we understand you to assert some of the submitted information is not subject to the Act. Section 552.002(a) of the Government Code defines "public information" as information that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

- (1) by a governmental body;
- (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:

¹ You state the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing 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 overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

- (A) owns the information;
 - (B) has a right of access to the information; or
 - (C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or
- (3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Gov't Code § 552.002(a). Thus, virtually all of the information in a governmental body's physical possession constitutes public information and thus is subject to the Act. *Id.* § 552.002(a)(1); *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 549 at 4 (1990), 514 at 1-2 (1988). Information is "in connection with the transaction of official business" if the information is created by, transmitted to, received by, or maintained by a person or entity performing official business or a government function on behalf of a governmental body and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body. *See* Gov't Code § 552.002(a-1). Moreover, section 552.001 of the Act provides that it is the policy of this state that each person is entitled, unless otherwise expressly provided by law, at all times to complete information about the affairs of government and the official acts of public officials and employees. *See id.* § 552.001(a). Upon review, we find the submitted information consists of information that was created and is maintained by the city for the transaction of official business. Accordingly, the submitted information is subject to the Act and must be released, unless the information falls within an exception to public disclosure under the Act.

Next, we note some of the submitted 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 submitted information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon, the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter Nos. 2020-00949 (2020), 2020-00985 (2020), 2020-14168 (2020), and 2020-22290 (2020) as previous determinations and withhold or release the previously ruled upon information in accordance with those rulings. *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 exceptions 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)-(2). Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. *Id.* §§ 143.051-.055. A letter of reprimand does not constitute discipline under chapter 143. *See* Attorney General Opinion JC-0257. 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* 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 assert the submitted information is confidential pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. We note section 143.021(b) of the Local Government Code provides that “[e]xcept for the department head and a person the department head appoints in accordance with Section 143.014 or 143.102, each fire fighter and police officer is classified as prescribed by this subchapter and has civil service protection.” Local Gov't Code § 143.021(b) (emphasis added). Section 143.003 of the Local Government Code defines “department head” as “the chief or head of a fire or police department or that person’s equivalent, regardless of the name or title used.” *Id.* § 143.003(2). Thus, information maintained by the city’s police department pertaining to the department head as defined by section 143.003 and a person the department head appoints in accordance with section 143.014 or section 143.102 is not confidential under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any of the information at issue is confidential under section 143.089(g). Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov't Code § 552.102(a). We understand you to assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 encompasses common-law privacy, which protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court of appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court has expressly disagreed with *Hubert's* interpretation of section 552.102(a), and held the privacy standard under section 552.102(a) differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). The supreme court also considered the applicability of section 552.102(a) and held it excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 348. Accordingly, the city must withhold the employee’s date of birth we marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. However, upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the city may not withhold any of it on that basis.

As previously noted, section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. 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. The Third 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.). We note the doctrine of common-law privacy generally protects the identifying information of juvenile offenders. *See* Open Records Decision No. 394 (1983); *cf.* Fam. Code § 58.008. However, we also note the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decisions Nos. 562 at 10 (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 542 (1990), 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees).

Upon review, we find the information we marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked and the public citizen's date of birth under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the submitted information falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual's privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 on the basis of constitutional privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home addresses, home telephone numbers, emergency contact information, and social security number of a peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with section 552.024 or

section 552.1175 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). It is unclear whether the city employees at issue are currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Accordingly, to the extent the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) pertains to employees that are currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12, the city must withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. Conversely, if the employees are not currently licensed peace officers, then the information at issue may be subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. However, no portion of the remaining information consists of a home address or telephone number, social security number, emergency contact information, or family member information pertaining to a current or former city employee and may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989)*. Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Accordingly, to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue are not currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12 and timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the individuals at issue are not currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12 and did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.117(a)(1). As noted above, no portion of the remaining information at issue consists of a home address or telephone number, social security number, emergency contact information, or family member information pertaining to a current or former city employee. Therefore, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release.² *See Gov't Code § 552.130*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

² 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.*

Section 552.137 of the Government Code provides, “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under [the Act],” unless the owner of the e-mail address has affirmatively consented to its release or the e-mail address is specifically excluded by subsection (c). *Id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 is not applicable to an institutional e-mail address, an Internet website address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or a personal e-mail address belonging to a city employee or official used to conduct official government business. *See id.* § 552.137(c); *Austin Bulldog v. Leffingwell*, 490 S.W.3d 240 (Tex. App.—Austin 2016, no pet.) (holding personal e-mail addresses of government officials used to conduct official government business are not e-mail addresses of “members of the public” for purposes of Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)). Accordingly, to the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information belong to members of the public and are not excluded by subsection 552.137(c) of the Government Code, the city must withhold these e-mail addresses, which we marked, under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the individuals to whom the e-mail addresses belong affirmatively consent to their release. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(b). However, to the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information are excluded by subsection 552.137(c) or belong to a government employee or official, the city may not withhold those e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the submitted information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon, the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter Nos. 2020-00949, 2020-00985, 2020-14168, and 2020-22290 as previous determinations and withhold or release the previously ruled upon information in accordance with those rulings. The city must withhold the employee’s date of birth we marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked and the public citizen’s date of birth under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) pertains to employees that are currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the city must withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. To the extent the individuals whose information is at issue are not currently licensed peace officers, but timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. To the extent the e-mail addresses within the remaining information belong to members of the public and are not excluded by subsection 552.137(c) of the Government Code, the city must withhold these e-mail addresses, which we marked, under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the individuals to whom the e-mail addresses belong affirmatively consent to their release. The city must 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-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,

Deborah Southerland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

DS/be

Ref: ID# 847221

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)