



April 9, 2001

Mr. Kuruvilla Oommen
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 1562
Houston, Texas 77251-1562

OR2001-1412

Dear Mr. Oommen:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 145766.

The Houston Police Department (the “department”) received a request for offense reports concerning incident numbers 0047878501 K, 006736501 A, and 4491101. You state no offense report for incident number 4491101 was generated. You further state that the requestor has been provided with a copy of the “Public Release Information” portion of the requested offense reports. We note that the Public Information Act (the “Act”) compels disclosure of public information that is in existence, but it does not require a government entity to prepare or assemble new information in response to a request. *Economic Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 268 (Tex. Civ. App. – San Antonio 1978, writ dism’d) (ruling that a government agency could not be required to make copies of documents no longer in its possession); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986). You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089 of the Local Government Code and section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure “information deemed confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Section 143.089 of the Local Government Code contemplates two different types of personnel files: one that the police department is required to maintain

as part of the officer's civil service file, and one that the police department may maintain for its own internal use. Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a), (g).

Section 143.089(g) provides:

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.

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 city police department for its use and addressed the applicability of section 143.089(g) to that file. The records included in the personnel file related to complaints against the police officer for which no disciplinary action was taken. The court determined that section 143.089(g) made these records confidential. *City of San Antonio*, 851 S.W.2d at 949; *see also City of San Antonio v. San Antonio Express-News*, No.04-99-00848-CV, 2000 WL 1918877 (Tex. App. -- San Antonio, Dec. 20, 2000, no pet. h.) (information reasonably relating to officer's employment relationship with department and maintained in the department's internal file pursuant to section 143.098(g) is confidential). In cases in which a police department takes disciplinary action against a police officer, it is required by section 143.089(a)(2) to place records relating to that investigation and disciplinary action in the personnel files maintained under section 143.089(a). Such records are subject to disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"). Local Gov't Code § 143.089(f); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 6 (1990). You explain that report number 004787501 A in Exhibit 2 relates to the department's ongoing criminal and internal affairs investigations. While we generally agree that the department's records of internal affairs investigations that do not result in disciplinary action are confidential under section 143.089(g), the information at issue is contained in department offense report and investigation records separate and apart from those of the internal affairs investigation. The department may not engraft section 143.089's confidentiality to other records that exist independently of the internal affairs investigation. Thus, the department must not withhold Exhibit 2 under section 143.089(g).

Next, we will consider your section 552.108 claim. Section 552.108(a) 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." Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain, if the information does not supply the explanation on its face, how and why the release of the requested

information would interfere with law enforcement. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.108(a)(1), (b)(1), .301(e)(1)(a); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You inform us that the department's investigations of a vicious dog resulting in the shooting of the dog by a police officer, number 004787501 K, and a burglary, number 006736501 A, are "open and active," and that "[r]elease of the offense reports would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crimes." Based upon your representation that the investigations are still ongoing and an examination of the responsive documents, we conclude that release of the offense reports 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), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases).

We note, however, that information normally found on the front page of an offense report is generally considered public. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.108(c); *Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.--Houston [14th Dist.] 1975), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976); Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976). Thus, you must release the types of information that is considered to be front page offense report information, even if this information is not actually located on the front page of the offense reports. Although section 552.108(a)(1) authorizes you to withhold the remaining information from disclosure, you may choose to release all or part of the information at issue that is not otherwise confidential by law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one

of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the General Services Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Yen-Ha Le
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

YHL/DBF/seg

Ref: ID# 145766

Encl. Submitted documents

cc: Mr. Rich Norris
7115 Thornwild
Missouri City, Texas 77489
(w/o enclosures)