



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 1, 2022

Mr. Trenton M. Dietz  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Abilene  
P.O. Box 60  
Abilene, Texas 79604-0060

OR2022-33937

Dear Mr. Dietz:

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# 981757 (Reference No. 22-1613).

The City of Abilene (the "city") received a request for the personnel file and any disciplinary records for a named city police department officer, including any communications between the named city police department officer and a named individual during stated time periods.<sup>1</sup> You state the city will redact motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code, certain information pursuant to section 552.136(c) of the Government Code, and dates of birth of members of the public pursuant to the previous determination issued in Open Records Letter No. 2019-32652 (2019).<sup>2</sup> We understand the city will redact information subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of

---

<sup>1</sup> You state, and provide documentation demonstrating, the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purposes of clarifying or narrowing request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

<sup>2</sup> Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact, without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office, the information described in section 552.136(b). *Id.* § 552.136(c); *see also id.* § 552.136(d)-(e) (requestor may appeal governmental body's decision to withhold information under section 552.136(c) to attorney general and governmental body withholding information pursuant to section 552.136(c) must provide certain notice to requestor). Open Records Letter No. 2019-32652 authorizes the city to withhold dates of birth of members

the Government Code as permitted by section 552.024(c) of the Government Code and information subject to section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 670 (2001).<sup>3</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.108, and 552.152 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>4</sup>

Initially, we note some of the submitted information may have been the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2020-17226 (2020). In that ruling, we determined, with the exception of the information we marked for release, the city must withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. We have no indication the law, facts, or circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have changed. Accordingly, to the extent the submitted information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2020-17226 as a previous determination and withhold and release the identical information in accordance with that ruling.<sup>5</sup> *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 prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes information is or is not excepted from disclosure). However, to the extent the submitted information is not identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon in Open Records Letter No. 2020-17226, we will address your arguments against its disclosure.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public 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. We understand the city is a civil service

---

of the public under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy without the necessity of requesting an attorney general’s decision.

<sup>3</sup> Section 552.117 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.024 of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to withhold information subject to section 552.117 without requesting a decision from this office if the current or former employee or official chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See id.* § 552.024(c). Open Records Decision No. 670 authorizes all governmental bodies to withhold the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, personal cellular telephone and pager numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of peace officers under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* ORD 670 at 6.

<sup>4</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.

<sup>5</sup> In this instance, as we are able to make this determination, we need not address the arguments against disclosure of this information.

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[.] . . . [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.* 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 maintained only in the city police department’s internal personnel file for the named city police officer under section 143.089(g). 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 the information we marked consists of periodic evaluations of the named city police officer. 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 the files maintained under both sections 143.089(a) and 143.089(g). Thus, the request encompasses both of these files. Therefore, the city may not withhold the marked periodic evaluations 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. Accordingly, with the exception of the information we marked for release, 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.<sup>6</sup>

You seek to withhold the identifying information of undercover officers within the remaining information. Section 552.152 of the Government Code provides:

Information in the custody of a governmental body that relates to an employee or officer of the governmental body is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if, under the specific circumstances pertaining to the employee or officer, disclosure of the information would subject the employee or officer to a substantial threat of physical harm.

Gov't Code § 552.152. You inform us some of the remaining information relates to undercover officers. Thus, to the extent the officers at issue in the remaining information are undercover officers, the city must withhold the identifying information of these officers under section 552.152 of the Government Code.<sup>7</sup> To the extent the officers at issue in the remaining information are not undercover officers, we find you have not demonstrated the release of the information at issue would subject a city employee to a substantial risk of physical harm, and the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.152 of the Government Code.

---

<sup>6</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

<sup>7</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

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. this office has also found the public has a legitimate interest in information relating to employees of governmental bodies and their employment qualifications and job performance. See Open Records Decision Nos. 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 405 at 2-3 (1983) (public has interest in manner in which public employee performs job). Upon review, we find none of the remaining information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the remaining information is not confidential under common-law privacy, and the city may not withhold it under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law physical safety exception. For many years, this office determined section 552.101, in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy, protected information from disclosure when “special circumstances” exist in which the disclosure of information would place an individual in imminent danger of physical harm. See, e.g., Open Records Decision Nos. 169 (1977) (special circumstances required to protect information must be more than mere desire for privacy or generalized fear of harassment or retribution), 123 (1976) (information protected by common-law right of privacy if disclosure presents tangible physical danger). However, the Texas Supreme Court has held freedom from physical harm does not fall under the common-law right to privacy. *Tex. Dep’t of Pub. Safety v. Cox Tex. Newspapers, L.P. & Hearst Newspapers, L.L.C.*, 343 S.W.3d 112 (Tex. 2011). Instead, in *Cox*, the court recognized, for the first time, a separate common-law physical safety exception to required disclosure that exists independent of the common-law right to privacy. *Id.* at 118. Pursuant to this common-law physical safety exception, “information may be withheld [from public release] if disclosure would create a substantial threat of physical harm.” *Id.* In applying this standard, the court noted “deference must be afforded” law enforcement experts regarding the probability of harm, but further cautioned, “vague assertions of risk will not carry the day.” *Id.* at 119. Upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate release of any of the remaining information would create a substantial threat of physical harm to several individuals. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law physical safety exception.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law informer’s privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. See *Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). The informer’s privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided the subject of the information does not already know the informer’s identity. See Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer’s privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to “administrative officials having a

duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres.” Open Records Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. See Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). You generally raise the common-law informer’s privilege for the remaining information. Upon review, however, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information identifies informers for purposes of the common-law informer’s privilege. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law informer’s privilege.

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, which is discussed above. See *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. 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. Upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information consists of dates of birth of city employees. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.102 of the Government Code.

You assert the remaining information is excepted under section 552.108 of the Government Code, which provides the following:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime;

(2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication;

(3) it is information relating to a threat against a peace officer or detention officer collected or disseminated under Section 411.048;  
or

(4) it is information that:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

(b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution;

(2) the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication; or

(3) the internal record or notation:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)-(b). A governmental body raising section 552.108 must reasonably explain the applicability of section 552.108. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A) (governmental body must provide comments explaining why exceptions raised should apply to information requested). We note the remaining information consists of personnel file records pertaining to the named city police officer. Section 552.108 is generally not applicable to purely administrative records, such as the records of an internal affairs investigation or personnel information, that do 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); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 at 3-4 (1982). Although you generally assert the remaining information is excepted under section 552.108, you have not specified the subsection of section 552.108 that applies to the information, nor have you submitted any specific arguments explaining how section 552.108 applies to the information. A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) or 552.108(b)(1) must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* § 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1); *Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You do not inform us the information at issue pertains to a specific ongoing criminal investigation or prosecution, nor have you explained how its release would interfere in some way with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108(a)(1) or

section 552.108(b)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(2) or section 552.108(b)(2) must demonstrate the requested information relates to a criminal investigation that has concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(2), (b)(2). You have not explained how the information at issue pertains to any specific investigation that concluded in a final result other than a conviction or deferred adjudication. Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of either section 552.108(a)(2) or section 552.108(b)(2). Section 552.108(a)(3) is also inapplicable as the information at issue does not relate to a threat against a police officer. *See id.* § 552.108(a)(3). Lastly, you do not assert the information at issue was prepared by an attorney representing the state or reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state. *See id.* § 552.108(a)(4), (b)(3). Thus, you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.108(a)(4) or section 552.108(b)(3). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the submitted information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2020-17226 as a previous determination and withhold and release the identical information in accordance with that ruling. With the exception of the information we marked for release, 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. To the extent the officers at issue in the remaining information are undercover officers, the city must withhold the identifying information of these officers under section 552.152 of the Government Code. 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,

James M. Graham  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JMG/eb

Mr. Trenton M. Dietz - Page 9

Ref: ID# 981757

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)