



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 20, 2005

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

OR2005-09531

Dear Mr. Weir:

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# 234660.

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received a request for information related to an internal affairs investigation of a police officer, a criminal investigation, and the city's insurance coverage information. You state that the city does not have insurance coverage information responsive to this request. 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 dism'd); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986). You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, 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 city may withhold this information only to the extent it is made confidential under other law. Although the department raises section 552.108 for this information, this exception is discretionary and thus, does not make information confidential. *See* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Therefore, the search warrants may not be withheld under section 552.108 of the Government Code. As the city 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 city must release the submitted search warrant affidavits.

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).

Medical records may be released only as provided under the MPA. Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). The medical records must be released upon 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. 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. Open Records Decision No. 565 at 7 (1990). Here, the requestor is an attorney representing one of the individuals whose medical records are at issue. The city must release these medical records to the requestor upon receipt of the proper consent. The city may only release the remaining 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 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).<sup>1</sup> *Abbott v. City of 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 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 is maintained in the police department’s internal files concerning this officer.<sup>2</sup> 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 552.108 of the Government Code. Section 552.108(a)(1) provides that information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from disclosure if “release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.108(a)(1). Generally, a governmental body claiming section 552.108(a)(1) as an exception to disclosure of requested information must demonstrate how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 552.108(a), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). You indicate that the remaining information pertains to an open criminal investigation. Based on

---

<sup>1</sup>Chapter 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.

<sup>2</sup>Section 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. You inform us that you have done so.

your representations and our review of the remaining information, we find that section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to this information.

We note, however, that section 552.108 does not except from disclosure basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime. *See* Gov't Code § 552.108(c). We believe such basic information refers to the information held to be public in *Houston Chronicle Publishing 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). *See* Open Records Decision No. 127 (1976) (summarizing types of basic information that must be made available to public, including detailed description of offense). Accordingly, with the exception of basic information that must be released to the requestor, we conclude that the city may withhold the remaining information pursuant to section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, that the city maintains the discretion to release all or part of this information that is not otherwise confidential by law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007.

In summary, the city must release the executed search warrants under section 552.022(a)(17) of the Government Code. The city must also release the submitted search warrant affidavits pursuant to article 18.01 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The city must release the requestor's client's medical records upon receipt of the proper consent under the MPA. The city may only release the remaining medical records in accordance with the MPA. The information maintained in the police department's internal files must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. With the exception of basic information, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.108 of the Government Code.

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,



James A. Person III  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JAP/sdk

Ref: ID# 234660

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jared Stenberg  
Carlson Law Firm  
13750 San Pedro Avenue, Suite 810  
San Antonio, Texas 78232  
(w/o enclosures)