



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 9, 2022

Ms. Victoria Hayslett  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Austin  
P.O. Box 1088  
Austin, Texas 78767-8828

OR2022-23695

Dear Ms. Hayslett:

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# 965463 (PIR# C135270).

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for certain communications containing specified keywords during a stated time period.<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The city informs us it 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 the 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 informs us the requestor narrowed his request in response to the cost estimate. *See id.* § 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).

<sup>2</sup> We note the city did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e). Nonetheless, because section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider its applicability to the submitted information. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352.

<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 letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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)-(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 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 contend the submitted information is confidential under section 143.089(g). You inform us at the time of the creation of the information at issue, the city and the Austin Police Association were parties to a Meet and Confer Agreement (the "agreement") created pursuant to chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. See Local Gov't Code §§ 143.301 *et seq.* Subchapter I includes section 143.307, which provides as follows:

- (a) An agreement under this subchapter supersedes a previous statute concerning wages, salaries, rates of pay, hours of work, or other terms and conditions of employment to the extent of any conflict with the statute.
- (b) An agreement under this subchapter preempts any contrary statute, executive order, local ordinance, or rule adopted by the state or a political subdivision or agent of the state, including a personnel board, a civil service commission, or a home-rule municipality.
- (c) An agreement under this subchapter may not diminish or qualify any right, benefit, or privilege of an employee under [chapter 143 of the Local Government Code] or other law unless approved by a majority vote by secret ballot of the members of the association recognized as a sole and exclusive bargaining agent.

*Id.* § 143.307; see *id.* § 143.302(1) (defining "association"). You explain the agreement established a citizen oversight system to review complaints of alleged misconduct by officers of the city's police department (the "department") and the system includes the police monitor's office. Section 8 of article 16 of the agreement, titled "Access to Section 143.089(g) Files," provides, in part:

- (a) Information concerning the administrative review of complaints against [police officers], including but not limited to Internal Affairs Division files and all contents thereof, are intended solely for the [d]epartment's use

pursuant to Section 143.089(g) of the Texas Local Government Code (the 143.089(g) file). All records of the Police Monitor's Office that relate to individual case investigations and the [department] 143.089(g) file, although same are not [department] files or records, shall have the same statutory character in the hands of the Police Monitor, and shall not be disclosed by any person, unless otherwise authorized by law or this [agreement]. Public access to such information is strictly governed by this [agreement] and Texas law. To the extent necessary to perform their duties, individuals involved in the Citizen Oversight process are granted a right of access to the information contained within the 143.089(g) files of [police officers] to the extent authorized by this [agreement].

Agreement art. 16, § 8(a); *see generally id.* art. 16. You state the submitted information pertains to complaints against certain city police officers that did not result in disciplinary action under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. On the basis of section 8(a) of the agreement, you contend the submitted information is confidential under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. Based on your representations and our review of the agreement and the information at issue, we conclude the city must withhold the submitted information 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,

Alexandra C. Burks  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ACB/jxd

Ref: ID# 965463

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)