



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 26, 2005

Mr. Charles H. Wier
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2005-08713

Dear Mr. Wier:

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# 232809.

The San Antonio Police Department (the "department") received three requests from the same requestor for several categories of information pertaining to a department officer and an alleged assault by the officer against the requestor's client. You state that you have no information responsive to several categories of the requests. We note that the Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex.Civ.App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986). You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the department'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. Gov't Code § 552.301(e). The department submitted the officer's Training Academy file, which it states is a component of the officer's departmental file, after the fifteen business day deadline prescribed by section 552.301(e) of the Government Code.

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 information is public and must be released. Information that is presumed public must be released unless a governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information to overcome this presumption. *See 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). 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). Although the department raises section 552.103 of the Government Code for this information, section 552.103 is a discretionary exception and does not constitute a compelling interest sufficient to overcome the presumption that the information at issue is now public.¹ Accordingly, we conclude that the department may not withhold the officer's Training Academy file under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, because section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to withhold information, we will address your arguments under this exception for the officer's Training Academy file, as well as the remainder of the officer's departmental file.

Next, we note that the submitted information includes executed search warrants and supporting affidavits. Section 552.022 of the Government Code provides in part:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

...

(17) information that is also contained in the public court record[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(17). Section 552.022(a)(17) makes the executed search warrants, which have been filed with a court, expressly public. Therefore, the department may withhold this information only to the extent it is made confidential under other law. Although the department raises sections 552.103 and 552.108 for this information, these exceptions are discretionary and thus, do not make information confidential. *See Open*

¹Discretionary exceptions are intended to protect only the interests of the governmental body, as distinct from exceptions which are intended to protect information deemed confidential by law or the interests of third parties. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 551 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 serves only to protect governmental body's position in litigation and does not itself make information confidential), 522 at 4 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general); *see also 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 section 552.103).

Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the search warrants may not be withheld under either section 552.103 or section 552.108 of the Government Code. As the department raises no further exceptions to the disclosure of this information, it must be released.

The release of a search warrant affidavit is governed by article 18.01 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which provides in part:

(b) No search warrant shall issue for any purpose in this state unless sufficient facts are first presented to satisfy the issuing magistrate that probable cause does in fact exist for its issuance. A sworn affidavit setting forth substantial facts establishing probable cause shall be filed in every instance in which a search warrant is requested. The affidavit is public information if executed, and the magistrate's clerk shall make a copy of the affidavit available for public inspection in the clerk's office during normal business hours.

Crim. Proc. Code art. 18.01(b). This provision makes the submitted search warrant affidavits expressly public. The exceptions found in the Act do not, as a general rule, apply to information that is made public by other statutes. *See* Open Records Decision No. 525 (1989) (statutory predecessor). Therefore, pursuant to article 18.01(b), the department must release the submitted search warrant affidavits.

The submitted information also includes an arrest warrant and supporting affidavit. The release of this information is governed by article 15.26 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, which states "[t]he arrest warrant, and any affidavit presented to the magistrate in support of the issuance of the warrant, is public information." Crim. Proc. Code art. 15.26. These provisions make the submitted arrest warrant and supporting affidavit expressly public. As previously noted, the exceptions found in the Act do not, as a general rule, apply to information that is made public by other statutes. Therefore, the department must release the submitted arrest warrant and supporting affidavit.

We further note that the submitted information contains medical records. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. Access to medical records is governed by the Medical Practice Act ("MPA"), chapter 159 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides:

(a) A communication between a physician and a patient, relative to or in connection with any professional services as a physician to the patient, is confidential and privileged and may not be disclosed except as provided by this chapter.

(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(a)-(c). Information that is subject to the MPA includes both medical records and information obtained from those medical records. *See* Occ. Code §§ 159.002, .004; Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). 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).

Section 159.002(c) requires that any subsequent release of medical records be consistent with the purposes for which the governmental body obtained the records. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). Medical records may be released only as provided under the MPA. Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). The MPA permits disclosure of MPA records to the patient, a person authorized to act on the patient's behalf, or a person who has the written consent of the patient. Occ. Code §§ 159.003, .004, .005. Here, the requestor is an attorney representing the individual whose medical records are at issue. Thus, the department may only release the submitted medical records in accordance with the MPA. Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991).

Section 552.101 also encompasses section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. The City of San Antonio 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 a city's 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).² *Abbott v. City of Corpus Christi*, 109

²Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. *See* Local Gov't Code §§ 143.051-.055. A letter of reprimand does not constitute discipline under chapter 143.

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 in 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 are subject to release under chapter 552 of the Government Code. *See* Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(f); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 6 (1990).

However, a document relating to a police officer’s alleged misconduct may not be placed in his civil service personnel file if there is insufficient evidence to sustain the charge of misconduct. Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(b). Information that reasonably relates to a police officer’s employment relationship with the police department and that is 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. San Antonio Express-News*, 47 S.W.3d 556 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2000, pet. denied); *City of San Antonio v. Tex. Attorney General*, 851 S.W.2d 946, 949 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied).

You inform us that a portion of the submitted information, including the officer’s Training Academy file, is maintained in the department’s internal files concerning this officer. You further state that documents substantiating any discipline have been properly copied to the officer’s civil service file.³ Based on your representations and our review of the submitted information, we agree that the officer’s departmental file 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.

With regard to the remaining submitted information, you assert section 552.103 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 provides in pertinent part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person’s office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably

³Section 143.089(g) requires a police department that receives a request for information maintained in a file under section 143.089(g) to refer that person to the civil service director or the director’s designee.

anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The department has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The department must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

In order to establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). In Open Records Decision No. 638 (1996), this office stated that a governmental body has met its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated when it received a notice of claim letter and the governmental body represents that the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act (“TTCA”), chapter 101 of the Texas Civil Practice & Remedies Code, or an applicable municipal ordinance. If a governmental body does not make this representation, the claim letter is a factor that this office will consider in determining whether a governmental body has established that litigation is reasonably anticipated based on the totality of the circumstances.

You assert that the department reasonably anticipates litigation relating to the subject of the present requests. You state that the requestor is the attorney representing the individual allegedly assaulted by the officer. You further state and provide documentation showing that, prior to receiving the present requests for information, the department received a claim letter and a notice of claim for damages resulting from the assault. You do not affirmatively represent to this office that the requestor’s claim letter is in compliance with the TTCA. However, after having reviewed the submitted documentation and your arguments, we conclude, based on the totality of the circumstances, that litigation was reasonably anticipated on the date the department received this request for information. Furthermore, we find that the remaining submitted information is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a).

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information that has either been obtained from or provided to the opposing party in the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and must be disclosed. Further, the

applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, the submitted search warrants, search warrant affidavits, arrest warrant, and arrest warrant affidavit are expressly public and must be released. The department may only release the submitted medical records in accordance with the MPA. The department must withhold the officer's departmental file, including the officer's Training file, pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. The remaining submitted information may be withheld pursuant to section 552.103 of the Government Code. As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Office of the Attorney General 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,



Lauren E. Kleine
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEK/jpa

Ref: ID# 232809

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Don L. Crook, Jr.
Wayne Wright, LLP
5707 Interstate Ten West
San Antonio, Texas 78201
(w/o enclosures)