



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 8, 2022

Mr. James Santangelo
Assistant City Attorney
City of Missouri City
1522 Texas Parkway
Missouri City, Texas 77489

OR2022-19618

Dear Mr. Santangelo:

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# 956157 (Ref. No. MCAG 22-29).

The City of Missouri City (the "city") received two requests from the same requestor for 1) a roster of the city police department's (the "department") current and former police officers during a certain time period, 2) certain internal department investigations during given time periods, and 3) the personnel file of a named department officer. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.103, 552.108, 552.117, 552.130, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the requestor specifically excluded social security numbers, personal telephone numbers, home addresses, certain family member information, certain motor vehicle record information, certain access device number information, and dates of birth from the present request. Thus, the portions of the submitted information that consists of those categories of information are 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 the request.¹

Next, we note the city has not submitted information responsive to the first category of the request. To the extent information responsive to this portion of the request existed on the

¹ As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your arguments against disclosure of this information.

date the city received the request, we assume you have released it. *See* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible). If you have not released any such information, you must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302.

We note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(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[.]

Id. § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information includes completed investigations that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The city must release the information at issue pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. Although you raise section 552.103 of the Government Code for some of the information at issue, this section is a discretionary exception to disclosure 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 Gov't Code § 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, none of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) may be withheld under section 552.103. However, we will consider your argument to withhold the information at issue under section 552.108 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Further, as sections 552.101 and 552.117 of the Government Code can make information confidential under the Act, we will consider your arguments under these sections for the information at issue.

Section 552.108(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if: (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime.” Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). We note section 552.108 is generally not applicable to records of an internal investigation that is purely administrative in nature and does not involve the investigation or prosecution of crime. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525-26 (Tex. Civ. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution). Exhibit C consists of an administrative investigation and personnel documentation of the named department officer. However, you

state this information resulted in a criminal investigation and prosecution and assert release of that information would interfere with the investigation and prosecution. Based upon this representation, we conclude the release of Exhibit C would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, the city may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code.²

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. The city states it 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 (2000). 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).

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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 use[.] . . . [T]he 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* 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).

The city asserts Exhibits D and E are confidential under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. We note Exhibits D and E include evaluations and documents relating to misconduct that resulted in disciplinary action. 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). In this instance, the request was received by the city, which has access to the 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 evaluations and documents relating to misconduct that resulted in disciplinary action under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which we have marked, in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. Upon review, we find the city has demonstrated section 143.089(g) is applicable to the remaining information at issue. Accordingly, the city must withhold the remaining information in Exhibits D and E under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code.³

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

³ As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987). Upon review, we find the information we have marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find no portion of the remaining responsive information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

Section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the internal records and notations of law enforcement agencies and prosecutors when their release would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 531 at 2 (1989) (quoting *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977)). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(b)(1) must explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(b)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect "information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the laws of this State." *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 at 327 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.). This office has concluded section 552.108(b)(1) excepts from public disclosure information relating to the security or operation of a law enforcement agency. *See, e.g.*, ORDs 531 (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 of the Government Code is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted). Section 552.108(b)(1) is not applicable, however, to generally known policies and procedures. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2–3 (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force not protected), 252 at 3 (governmental body failed to indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were any different from those commonly known).

You state some of the remaining responsive information, if released, would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution of crime. However, upon review, we find you have not demonstrated release of any of the remaining responsive information at issue would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining responsive information at issue under section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, and social security

number of a current or honorably retired peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the current or honorably retired peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the current or honorably retired peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2); *id.* § 552.003(1-b) (defining “honorably retired” for purposes of the Act). We note, for purposes of section 552.117, “family member” means a spouse, minor child, or adult child who resides in the person’s home. *See id.* § 552.117(c) (providing that “family member” has meaning assigned by Fin. Code § 31.006(d)). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. In addition, we conclude section 552.117 of the Government Code is not applicable to the remaining responsive information, and the city may not withhold it on that ground.

In summary, the city may withhold Exhibit C under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. With the exception of the information we have marked for release, the city must withhold Exhibits D and E under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the 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,

Meredith L. Coffman
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MLC/mo

Ref: ID# 956157

c: Requestor