



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 19, 2007

Ms. Beverly West Stephens
Assistant City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283

OR2007-13748

Dear Ms. Stephens:

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# 292920.

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received three requests from the same requestor for information relating to the following: a named San Antonio Police Department officer, complaints of excessive force or racial profiling against San Antonio police officers from the year 2000 to the date of the request, and information related to body cavity searches for the years 2000 to the date of the request. You state that some of the requested information did not exist at the time the city received the requests.¹ You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.119, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code. You also indicate that the city will redact social security numbers in the submitted records pursuant to sections 552.117 and 552.147 of the Government Code.²

¹The Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received, nor does it require a governmental body to prepare new information in response to a request. *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); Open Records Decision Nos. 452 at 2-3 (1986), 342 at 3 (1982), 87 (1975); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 572 at 1 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 416 at 5 (1984).

²This office has issued a previous determination allowing all governmental bodies to redact certain personal information of peace officers under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision No. 670 (2001) (previous determination that governmental body may withhold home address, home telephone number, personal cellular telephone number, personal pager number, social security number and information that reveals whether individual has family members, of any individual who meets definition of "peace officer" set forth in article 2.12 of Texas Code of Criminal Procedure without necessity of requesting attorney general decision as to whether exception under section 552.117(a)(2) applies). We note that section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act.

We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information,³ portions of which consist of representative samples.⁴

The requestor indicates that the city has previously released some of the requested information that the city now seeks to withhold from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Section 552.007 of the Government Code provides that if a governmental body voluntarily releases information to any member of the public, the governmental body may not withhold such information from further disclosure unless its public release is expressly prohibited by law. *See* Gov't Code 552.007; Open Records Decision No. 518 at 3 (1989); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 400 (1983) (governmental body may waive right to claim permissive exceptions to disclosure under the Act, but it may not disclose information made confidential by law). Section 552.103 of the Government Code is a discretionary exception under the Act, and does not make information confidential or expressly prohibit its release for purposes of section 552.007. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; *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). Accordingly, to the extent any of the submitted information was previously voluntarily released to the public by the city, the city may not now withhold that information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

We note that some of the submitted documents are medical records of the requestor's client, access to which is governed by the Medical Practice Act (the "MPA"), subtitle B of title 3 of the Occupations Code. Section 159.002 of the MPA provides in part the following:

(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.

³We note that the city has redacted information other than information encompassed by sections 552.117(a)(2) and 552.147. As we are able in this instance to discern the nature of the redacted information, we will determine whether it is excepted from public disclosure. In the future, the city should refrain from redacting any information that it submits to this office in seeking an open records ruling. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D), .302.

⁴We assume that the "representative samples" of records submitted to this office are 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.

Occ. Code § 159.002(b), (c). 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. *Id.* §§ 159.004, 159.005. 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). Medical records may be released only as provided under the MPA. Open Records Decision No. 598 (1991). We have marked the portion of the submitted information that constitutes medical records and that may only be released in accordance with the MPA.

We also note that some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 of the Government Code provides that:

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:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by [s]ection 552.108;

...

(5) all working papers, research material, and information used to estimate the need for or expenditure of public funds or taxes by a governmental body, on completion of the estimate[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1), (5). The submitted information includes completed evaluations and investigations and completed estimates of the need for the expenditure of public funds. The city must release the completed evaluations and the completed investigations under section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code unless they are excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or are expressly confidential under other law. The city must release the completed estimates unless they are expressly confidential under other law. You claim that the information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We note, however, that section 552.103 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects the governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See 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 of the Government Code); Open Records Decision No. 542 at 4 (1990) (litigation exception may be waived). As such, section 552.103 of the Government Code is not other law that makes information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022 of the Government Code. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, you also claim that portions of the information that is subject to section 552.022 are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.119, and 552.130 of the Government Code, which are other laws for

purposes of section 552.022. Accordingly, we will consider the applicability of these exceptions to the documents that are subject to section 552.022, as well as the remaining information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” This section excepts from disclosure information deemed confidential by statute, such as section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. You state that the city is a civil service municipality 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).⁵ *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* Local Gov’t Code § 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 information you have marked is maintained in the police department’s internal file pursuant to section 143.089(g). We therefore conclude 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.

Section 552.101 also encompasses statutes governing criminal history record information (“CHRI”). CHRI generated by the National Crime Information Center (“NCIC”) or by the Texas Crime Information Center (“TCIC”) is confidential under federal and state law. Title 28, part 20 of the Code of Federal Regulations governs the release of CHRI that states obtain from the federal government or other states. ORD 565 (1990). The federal regulations allow each state to follow its individual law with respect to CHRI it generates. *Id.* Section 411.083 of the Government Code deems confidential CHRI that the Department of Public Safety (“DPS”) maintains, except that the DPS may disseminate this information

⁵Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. *See* Local Gov’t Code §§ 143.051-143.055.

as provided in chapter 411, subchapter F of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code §411.083. Sections 411.083(b)(1) and 411.089(a) authorize a criminal justice agency to obtain CHRI; however, a criminal justice agency may not release CHRI except to another criminal justice agency for a criminal justice purpose. *Id.* §411.089(b)(1). Other entities specified in chapter 411 of the Government Code are entitled to obtain CHRI from DPS or another criminal justice agency; however, those entities may not release CHRI except as provided by chapter 411. *See generally id.* §§ 411.090 -.127. Furthermore, any CHRI obtained from DPS or any other criminal justice agency must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with Government Code chapter 411, subchapter F. Upon review, however, we find that the remaining information does not include any CHRI. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 on this basis.

We note that one of the completed investigations includes an ST-3 accident report form that appears to have been completed pursuant to chapter 550 of the Transportation Code. *See* Transp. Code § 550.064 (officer's accident report). Section 552.101 also encompasses section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code, which 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 Texas Department of Transportation 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 of the items of information specified by the statute. *Id.* In this instance, the requestor has not provided the information required by section 550.065(c)(4) of the Transportation Code. Accordingly, the city must withhold the submitted ST-3 form in its entirety pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 550.065 of the Transportation Code.

We next address the city's assertion that the remaining information includes information that is confidential under chapter 560 of the Government Code. Chapter 560 provides that a governmental body may not release fingerprint information except in certain limited circumstances. *See id.* §§ 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). Upon review, however, we find that none of the remaining information is made confidential by section 560.003. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 on this basis.

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. In this instance, you state that the peace officer whose photographs you have marked is "currently assigned to [an] undercover position" with the city police department and that "the release of [his] photographs would endanger [his life] and physical safety." Thus, we find that you have demonstrated the applicability of section 552.119 to the photographs that you have marked. Furthermore, none of the exceptions to section 552.119 appear to apply. Therefore, the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.119.

You also claim that portions of the completed investigations are excepted from disclosure under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 excepts from public disclosure information that relates to "a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit issued by an agency of this state[.]" Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1). Therefore, the city must withhold the Texas motor vehicle information that we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

We next address your argument under section 552.103 of the Government Code for the remaining information that is not subject to section 552.022(a)(1). Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in relevant 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 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 governmental body 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 when 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 governmental body 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 that representation is not made, the receipt of the claim letter is a factor that we will consider in determining, from the totality of the circumstances presented, whether the governmental body has established that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 638 at 4 (1996).

You inform us that, prior to its receipt of the present requests, the city received a notice of claims concerning “allegations of excessive force and violations of civil rights[.]” You have provided this office with a copy of this notice for our review. You represent that the notice is in compliance with the requirements of the TTCA. Based on your representations and our review of the submitted documentation, we find that you have demonstrated that the city reasonably anticipated litigation on the date of its receipt of these requests for information. Furthermore, we find that the remaining information is related to the anticipated litigation for purposes of section 552.103(a). Accordingly, the remaining submitted information may be withheld under section 552.103.

In reaching this conclusion, we assume that the opposing party in the anticipated litigation has not seen or had access to the information at issue. The purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information that relates to the litigation through discovery procedures. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4-5 (1990). If the opposing party has seen or had access to information that relates to anticipated litigation, through discovery or otherwise, then there is no interest in withholding the information from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Furthermore, the applicability of

section 552.103 ends when the related litigation concludes or is no longer reasonably anticipated. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

We note that some of the submitted information includes notice of copyright protection. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, to the extent any of the information that the city seeks to withhold has been previously voluntarily released to the public, it may not now be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code. The medical records of the requestor's client, which we have marked, may only be released in accordance with the MPA. The submitted information that is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which we have marked, may not be withheld under section 552.103. The submitted information that is maintained in the police department's internal personnel files pursuant to section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code is confidential and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code. The ST-3 accident report must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 550.065(b) of the Transportation Code. The department must withhold the peace officer's photographs that you have marked under section 552.119 of the Government Code. The Texas motor vehicle record information that we have marked must be withheld under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Other than information that has been previously voluntarily released to the public or is subject to section 552.022, the city may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.⁶ The remaining information must be released to the requestor. In releasing the remaining information, the department must release information protected by copyright only in accordance with copyright law.

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

⁶As our ruling on this issue is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

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,



L. Joseph James
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LJJ/eeg

Ref: ID# 292920

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. James L. Myart
The Preston House
1104 Denver Boulevard, Suite 300
San Antonio, Texas 78210
(w/o enclosures)