



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 12, 2011

Mr. John S. Schneider
First Assistant City Attorney
City of Pasadena
P.O. Box 672
Pasadena, Texas 77501-0672

OR2011-18183

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# 440108 (SL1175).

The City of Pasadena (the "city") received a request for a specified notice of appeal involving a named officer. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted 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." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses information made confidential by other statutes, such as section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. We understand 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 for police officers in a civil service city: a civil service file the civil service director is required to maintain and an internal file the police department may maintain for its own use. Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a), (g). The officer's civil service file must contain certain specified items, including commendations, periodic evaluations by the police officer's supervisor, and documents relating to any misconduct in which the department took disciplinary action against the officer under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. *Id.* § 143.089(a)(1)-(2). Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. *Id.* §§ 143.051-.055; *see* Attorney General Opinion JC-0257 (written

reprimand is not disciplinary action for purposes of chapter 143 of the Local Government Code).

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. 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. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 851 S.W.2d 946, 949 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied).

You state the submitted information relates to misconduct that resulted in the indefinite suspension of the police officer named in the request, and you inform us the officer is now appealing his suspension. Although you contend this information must be maintained in the police department's confidential internal file created under section 143.089(g) because of the pending appeal, we note that an officer's civil service file must contain documents relating to any misconduct in those cases where the police department took disciplinary action against the officer. *See Local Gov't Code* § 143.089(a)(2); *see also id.* §§ 143.051-.055 (describing "disciplinary action" for purposes of section 143.089(a)(2)); Attorney General Opinion JC-0257 (2000). We note section 143.089(c) provides that information that must be placed in a civil service file under section 143.089(a)(2) may be removed if the civil service commission determines that (1) the disciplinary action was taken without just cause or (2) the charge of misconduct was not supported by sufficient evidence. *See Local Gov't Code* § 143.089(c). Section 143.089(c), therefore, signifies that complaint files resulting in disciplinary action must be placed in the civil service file during the pendency of the appeal. We find the submitted information relates to misconduct that resulted in disciplinary action against the officer at issue. Therefore, the submitted information must be maintained in the officer's civil service file pursuant to section 143.089(a)(2), and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code.

You also assert the submitted information is protected by section 552.103 of the Government Code, which 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). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception applies 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 requested information is related to that litigation. *See 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 parts of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To demonstrate litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party.¹ Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

¹In addition, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

In this instance, you inform us that the submitted information pertains to the appeal filed by the officer at issue. You state municipal civil service appeals, such as the one requested by the officer at issue, are governed by chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. *See* Local Gov't Code §§ 143.057, .127-.131. You contend that the civil service appeal in this instance constitute "litigation," and you contend that the document at issue is related to the pending litigation for purposes of section 552.103. This office has determined that such appeal proceedings constitute litigation for purposes of section 552.103. *Cf.* Open Records Decision No. 588 (1991) (discussing factors used by attorney general in determining whether administrative proceeding not subject to Administrative Procedure Act may be considered to be litigation). The officer whose information is at issue filed his appeal before the date the city received the request. Therefore, we find litigation was pending on the date of the request, and we agree the information at issue relates to the litigation. Accordingly, we find section 552.103 generally applies to the submitted information. We note, however, the opposing party has seen or had access to the submitted information. The purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties seeking information relating to the litigation to obtain such information through discovery procedures. *See* ORD 551 at 4-5. Thus, once the opposing party in pending litigation has seen or had access to information that is related to the litigation, there is no interest in withholding such information from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Accordingly, because the opposing party to the litigation has seen or had access to the submitted information, it may not be withheld under section 552.103.

We note the information at issue contains a personal e-mail address. 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).² *See* Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address at issue is not specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). As such, this e-mail addresses, which we have marked, must be withheld under section 552.137, unless the owner of the address has affirmatively consented to its release.³ *See id.* § 552.137(b). As no further exceptions are raised, the remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

³Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009) serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including e-mail addresses of members of the public under section 552.137, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Vanessa Burgess
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

VB/dls

Ref: ID# 440108

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)