



**ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS**  
**GREG ABBOTT**

May 5, 2004

Mr. Robert J. Gervais  
City Attorney  
City of Texas City  
P.O. Drawer 2608  
Texas City, Texas 77592-2608

OR2004-3647

Dear Mr. Gervais:

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# 200870.

The City of Texas City (the "city") received a request for six categories of information related to a named former police officer, including the officer's personnel file. You state that the officer's civil service file is being released to the requestor. You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.117, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Before addressing your arguments for the submitted information, we note that some of the submitted documents appear to have been produced in response to a grand jury subpoena. Article 20.02 of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides for the secrecy of grand jury proceedings. This office has concluded that grand juries are not governmental bodies that are subject to chapter 552 of the Government Code, so that records that are within the actual or constructive possession of a grand jury are not subject to disclosure under chapter 552.

---

<sup>1</sup>We assume that 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.

*See* Open Records Decision No. 513 (1988). When an individual or entity acts at the direction of the grand jury as its agent, information prepared or collected by the agent is within the grand jury's constructive possession and is not subject to chapter 552. *Id.* at 3. Information that is not so held or maintained is subject to chapter 552 and may be withheld only if a specific exception to disclosure is applicable. *Id.* Thus, to the extent that the information at issue is in the custody of the city as agent of the grand jury, it is not subject to disclosure under chapter 552. *Id.* at 4. However, to the extent that this information is not in the custody of the city as agent of the grand jury, it is subject to disclosure under chapter 552. To that extent, we address your claims for this information, as well as for the remaining submitted information.

We must address the city's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code. Pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) general written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. You did not submit to this office a copy or representative sample of the requested information within fifteen business days as required by section 552.301(e). Consequently, the city failed to comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Generally speaking, a compelling reason exists when third party interests are at stake or when information is confidential under other law. Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). We will therefore consider whether any of the submitted information is confidential.

Included among the submitted documents are several accident report forms that appear to have been completed pursuant to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. *See* Transp. Code § 550.064 (officer's accident report). Section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code states that except as provided by subsection (c), accident reports are privileged and confidential. Section 550.065(c)(4) provides for release of accident reports to a person who provides two of the following three pieces of information: (1) date of the accident; (2) name of any person involved in the accident; and (3) specific location of the accident. Transp. Code § 550.065(c)(4)). Under this provision, the Department of Public Safety or another

governmental entity is required to release a copy of an accident report to a person who provides the agency with two or more pieces of information specified by the statute. *Id.* In the situation at hand, the requestor has not provided the department with two of the three pieces of information. Thus, the city must withhold the submitted accident reports under section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code.

We next note that a portion of the submitted information constitutes medical record information, access to which is governed by the Medical Practice Act ("MPA"), chapter 159 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 provides in pertinent part:

(b) A record of the identity, diagnosis, evaluation, or treatment of a patient by a physician that is created or maintained by a physician is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(c) A person who receives information from a confidential communication or record as described by this chapter, other than a person listed in Section 159.004 who is acting on the patient's behalf, may not disclose the information except to the extent that disclosure is consistent with the authorized purposes for which the information was first obtained.

Occ. Code § 159.002(b), (c). This office has concluded that the protection afforded by section 159.002 extends only to records created by either a physician or someone under the supervision of a physician. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 487 (1987), 370 (1983), 343 (1982). Further, information that is subject to the MPA also includes information that was obtained from medical records. *See* Occ. Code § 159.002(a), (b), (c); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). Medical records must be released upon the governmental body's receipt of the patient's signed, written consent, provided that the consent specifies (1) the information to be covered by the release, (2) reasons or purposes for the release, and (3) the person to whom the information is to be released. *See* Occ. Code §§ 159.004, .005. Section 159.002(c) also requires that any subsequent release of medical records be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. *See* Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). We have marked the medical record information that is subject to the MPA. Absent the applicability of an MPA access provision, the city must withhold this information pursuant to the MPA.<sup>2</sup>

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling on this issue is dispositive, we need not address your claim under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act ("HIPAA"). *See* Open Records Decision No. 681 (2004) (HIPAA, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1320d-1320d-8, does not make information confidential for purpose of section 552.101 of Government Code).

information protected by other statutes, such as section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. You state that the city is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089 contemplates two different types of personnel files, a police officer's civil service file that the civil service director is required to maintain, and an internal file that the police department may maintain for its own use. Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a), (g). 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 (no pet.). Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. Local Gov't Code §§ 143.051 - .055. Such investigatory records are subject to release under chapter 552 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 143.089(f); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 6 (1990). However, information maintained in a police department's internal file pursuant to section 143.089(g) is confidential and must not be released. *City of San Antonio v. Texas Attorney Gen.*, 851 S.W.2d 946, 949 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied).

You state that the remaining submitted information is maintained in the city police department's internal file pursuant to section 143.089(g), and that none of this information is subject to section 143.089(a). However, we note that the submitted information that you state is maintained in the department's internal file includes evaluations of the named officer. The section 143.089(a) personnel file also must contain "any letter, memorandum, or document relating to . . . the periodic evaluation of [the officer] by a supervisor." *Id.* § 143.089(a)(3). Thus, while this information, which we have marked, may be kept in the department's internal file, it must also be kept in the civil service personnel file. Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a)(1), (3). Therefore, although the evaluations maintained in the department's internal personnel file are confidential under section 143.089(g), the evaluations in the civil service personnel file are not confidential under that provision and may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent that the information at issue is in the custody of the city as agent of the grand jury, it is not subject to disclosure under chapter 552. To the extent that the submitted information is not in the custody of the city as agent of the grand jury, we conclude that the submitted accident reports must be withheld under section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code. Absent the applicability of an MPA access provision, the city must withhold medical record information pursuant to the MPA. The remaining submitted information is confidential pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code; however, the submitted evaluations of the named officer must also be contained in the city's civil service

personnel file where they are not confidential under section 143.089(g) and may not be withheld under section 552.101.<sup>3</sup>

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 Dep't of Pub. 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 Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512)475-2497.

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we do not address your remaining claims.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. 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,



Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/jh

Ref: ID# 200870  
Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Maxine Waldrop  
1112 Park Lane  
Texas City, Texas 77590  
(w/o enclosures)