ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 27, 2006

Mr. Leonard V. Schneider
Ross, Banks, May, Cron & Cavin, P.C.
Attorney for The City of League City
2 Riverway, Suite 700
Houston, Texas 77056-1918

OR2006-11264

Dear Mr. Schneider:

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# 260523.

The City of League City (the "city"), which you represent, received five requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to five named police officers. You state that the city does not possess information responsive to portions of the requests for information. 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). You state that the city has released some of the requested information to the requestor with social security numbers redacted. *See* Gov't Code § 552.147(b) (governmental body may redact social security number from public release without necessity of requesting decision from this office under the Act). You also state that information from the officers' civil service files maintained by the city pursuant to section 143.089(a) of the Local Government Code will be provided to the requestor, with portions of the information redacted pursuant to a previous determination issued by this office in Open Records Decision No. 670 (2001).[1] You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.114, 552.115, 552.119, 552.122, 552.130, 552.136, 552.137, and 552.140 of the Government

[1]*See* Open Records Decision No. 670 at 6 (2001) (authorizing all governmental bodies that are subject to the Act to withhold home addresses and telephone numbers, personal cellular telephone numbers, personal pager numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of peace officers without the necessity of requesting attorney general decision under section 552.117(a)(2); *see also* Gov't Code § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (delineating circumstances under which attorney general decision constitutes previous determination under section 552.301).

Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.[2]

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, such as section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. The City of League 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).[3] *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 the Act. *See id.* § 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).

---

[2]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.

[3]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.

You inform us that the information submitted as Exhibits 4, 5, 6, and 7 is maintained in the police department's internal files concerning the officers at issue, and that these investigations did not result in disciplinary action. Based on your representations and our review of the records at issue, we agree that this 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.[4]

We now address your arguments regarding the civil service files, submitted as Exhibits 1, 2, and 3. You claim that the submitted information contains fingerprint information that is governed by sections 560.001, 560.002, and 560.003 of the Government Code, which are also encompassed by section 552.101 of the Government Code. Chapter 560 of the Government Code provides that a governmental body may not release fingerprint information except in certain limited circumstances. *See* Gov't Code §§ 560.001 (defining "biometric identifier" to include fingerprints), .002 (prescribing manner in which biometric identifiers must be maintained and circumstances in which they can be released), .003 (providing that biometric identifiers in possession of governmental body are exempt from disclosure under Act). You do not inform us, and the submitted information does not indicate, that section 560.002 permits the disclosure of the submitted fingerprint information. Therefore, the city must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code.

Next, we note that the civil service files contain ST-3 accident report forms, completed pursuant to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. *See* Transp. Code § 550.064 (Texas Peace Officer's Accident Report form). 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 the 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. *Id.* § 550.065(c)(4). Under this provision, the Department of Public Safety or another governmental body is required to release a copy of an accident report to a person who provides the governmental body with two or more pieces of information specified by the statute. *Id.* In the present request, the requestor has not provided the required information. Accordingly, the city must withhold the submitted accident report forms pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with section 550.065(c) of the Transportation Code.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the common law right of privacy, which protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental

---

[4]As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we need not address your arguments under sections 552.114, 552.115, 552.122, and 552.140 of the Government Code.

or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. This office has found that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses is protected under common law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps).

Common law privacy also encompasses certain types of personal financial information. This office has determined that financial information that relates only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first element of the common law privacy test, but the public has a legitimate interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9-12 (1992) (identifying public and private portions of certain state personnel records), 545 at 4 (1990) (attorney general has found kinds of financial information not excepted from public disclosure by common law privacy to generally be those regarding receipt of governmental funds or debts owed to governmental entities), 523 at 4 (1989) (noting distinction under common law privacy between confidential background financial information furnished to public body about individual and basic facts regarding particular financial transaction between individual and public body), 373 at 4 (1983) (determination of whether public's interest in obtaining personal financial information is sufficient to justify its disclosure must be made on case-by-case basis). Thus, a public employee's allocation of part of the employee's salary to a voluntary investment program offered by the employer is a personal investment decision, and information about that decision is protected by common law privacy. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9-12 (1992) (participation in TexFlex), 545 at 3-5 (1990) (deferred compensation plan). We have marked the information that must be withheld by the city under section 552.101 in conjunction with common law privacy.

The submitted information includes photographs of three of the police officers at issue. Section 552.119 of the Government Code provides:

> (a) A photograph that depicts a peace officer as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure, the release of which would endanger the life or physical safety of the officer, is excepted from [required public disclosure] unless:
>
> > (1) the officer is under indictment or charged with an offense by information;
> >
> > (2) the officer is a party in a civil service hearing or a case in arbitration; or
> >
> > (3) the photograph is introduced as evidence in a judicial proceeding.

> (b) A photograph excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) may be made public only if the peace officer gives written consent to the disclosure.

Gov't Code § 552.119. Under section 552.119, a governmental body must demonstrate, if the documents do not demonstrate on their face, that release of the photograph would endanger the life or physical safety of a peace officer.[5] Furthermore, a photograph of a peace officer cannot be withheld under section 552.119 if (1) the officer is under indictment or charged with an offense by information; (2) the officer is a party in a civil service hearing or a case in arbitration; (3) the photograph is introduced as evidence in a judicial proceeding; or (4) the officer gives written consent to the disclosure.

In this instance, you have not demonstrated, nor is it apparent from our review of the submitted information, that release of the photographs at issue would endanger the life or physical safety of the peace officers depicted. We therefore determine that the city may not withhold the photographs of the officers pursuant to section 552.119 of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides in relevant part:

> (a) Information is excepted from the requirement of Section 552.021 if the information relates to:
>
> > (1) a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state; [or]
> >
> > (2) a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state[.]

Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1), (2). Accordingly, the city must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information that we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." *Id.* § 552.136. The city must therefore withhold the account number we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body" unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses we have marked are not of the type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Therefore, unless the individuals at issue consented to the release of

---

[5] "Peace officer" is defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

their e-mail addresses, the city must withhold them in accordance with section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code, the city must withhold (1) the information submitted as Exhibits 4, 5, 6, and 7 in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code, (2) the marked fingerprint information in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code, (3) the submitted ST-3 accident report forms in conjunction with section 550.065(c) of the Transportation Code; and (4) the information we have marked under common law privacy. The city must also withhold: (1) the Texas motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code, (2) the account number we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code, and (3) the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released.

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,

Lisa V. Cubriel

Lisa V. Cubriel
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LVC/eb

Ref: ID# 260523

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Mike Carnahan
440 Louisiana, Suite 1500
Houston, Texas 77002-1691
(w/o enclosures)