



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

November 8, 2012

Ms. Cary Grace  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Austin  
P.O. Box 1088  
Austin, Texas 78767-8828

OR2012-18010

Dear Ms. Grace:

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# 470366.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for certain e-mail correspondence, letters, reports, memoranda, public statements, and press releases referencing the requestor during a specified time period, except for communications from the requestor. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, a portion of which you have marked, is non-responsive because it consists of communications from the requestor. This ruling does not address the public availability of non-responsive information, and the city is not required to release non-responsive information in response to the present request.

---

<sup>1</sup>We assume the "representative sample" of information 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.

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. Section 552.101 encompasses information protected by section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. You inform us the city is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code.

Section 143.089 provides for the maintenance of two different types of personnel files for each police officer employed by a civil service city: one that must be maintained as part of the officer’s civil service file and another that the police department may maintain for its own internal use. See Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(a), (g). Under section 143.089(a), 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 any instance 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. 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. 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 are in the 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 may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089 of the Local Government Code. See Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(f); Open Records Decision No. 562 at 6 (1990). Information relating to alleged misconduct or disciplinary action taken must be removed from the police officer’s civil service file if the police department determines that there is insufficient evidence to sustain the charge of misconduct or that the disciplinary action was taken without just cause. See Local Gov’t Code § 143.089(b)-(c).

Section 143.089(g) authorizes a police department to maintain, for its own use, a separate and independent internal personnel file relating to a police officer. See *id.* § 143.089(g). Section 143.089(g) provides as follows:

A fire or police department may maintain a personnel file on a fire fighter or police officer employed by the department for the department’s use, but the department may not release any information contained in the department file

to any agency or person requesting information relating to a fire fighter or police officer. The department shall refer to the director or the director's designee a person or agency that requests information that is maintained in the fire fighter's or police officer's personnel file.

*Id.* § 143.089(g). In *City of San Antonio v. Texas Attorney General*, 851 S.W.2d 946 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied), the court addressed a request for information contained in a police officer's personnel file maintained by the police department for its use and the applicability of section 143.089(g) to that file. The records included in the departmental personnel file related to complaints against the police officer for which no disciplinary action was taken. The court determined section 143.089(g) made these records confidential. See 851 S.W.2d at 949; see also *City of San Antonio v. San Antonio Express-News*, 47 S.W.3d 556 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 2000, pet. denied) (restricting confidentiality under Local Gov't Code § 143.089(g) to "information reasonably related to a police officer's or fire fighter's employment relationship"); Attorney General Opinion JC-0257 at 6-7 (2000) (addressing functions of Local Gov't Code § 143.089(a) and (g) files).

You contend some of the submitted information is confidential under section 143.089(g). You inform us at the time of the creation of the information at issue, the city and the Austin Police Association were parties to a Meet and Confer Agreement (the "agreement") under subchapter I of chapter 143 of the Local Government Code.<sup>2</sup> See Local Gov't Code § 143.301 *et seq.* Subchapter I includes section 143.307, which provides as follows:

(a) An agreement under this subchapter supersedes a previous statute concerning wages, salaries, rates of pay, hours of work, or other terms and conditions of employment to the extent of any conflict with the statute.

(b) An agreement under this subchapter preempts any contrary statute, executive order, local ordinance, or rule adopted by the state or a political subdivision or agent of the state, including a personnel board, a civil service commission, or a home-rule municipality.

(c) An agreement under this subchapter may not diminish or qualify any right, benefit, or privilege of an employee under [chapter 143 of the Local Government Code] or other law unless approved by a majority vote by secret ballot of the members of the association recognized as a sole and exclusive bargaining agent.

*Id.* § 143.307; see *id.* § 143.302(1) (defining "association"). You explain the agreement establishes a citizen oversight system to review complaints of alleged misconduct by city

---

<sup>2</sup>You have provided a copy of the relevant agreement.

police officers and the system includes the Office of the Police Monitor (the “police monitor’s office”) and a citizen’s review panel. You state the police monitor’s office administers the review panel’s activities and is responsible for keeping records of the panel’s meetings. Section 8 of article 16 of the agreement, titled “Access to Section 143.089(g) Files,” provides in part:

(a) Information concerning the administrative review of complaints against [police] officers, including but not limited to Internal Affairs Division files and all contents thereof, are intended solely for the [d]epartment’s use pursuant to Section 143.089(g) of the Texas Local Government Code (the 143.089(g) file.). All records of the Police Monitor’s Office that relate to individual case investigations and the [department] 143.089(g) file, although same are not [department] files or records, shall have the same statutory character in the hands of the Police Monitor, and shall not be disclosed by any person, unless otherwise authorized by law. Public access to such information is strictly governed by this agreement and Texas law. To the extent necessary to perform their duties, individuals involved in the Citizen Oversight process are granted a right of access to the information contained within the 143.089(g) files of police officers.

Agreement art. 16, § 8(a); *see generally id.* art. 16 (“Citizen Oversight of the Austin Police Department”). You state the information you have marked consists of the police monitor’s office’s records of an investigation of a city police officer that did not result in disciplinary action under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. On the basis of section 8(a) of the agreement, you contend the information at issue is confidential under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. Based on your representations and our review of the agreement and the information at issue, we conclude the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g).

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. Gov’t Code § 552.107(1). When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act

in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a *confidential* communication, *id.*, meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You explain the information you have marked constitutes confidential communications between assistant city attorneys, a city paralegal, and other city personnel that were made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the city. You also assert the communications were intended to be confidential and their confidentiality has been maintained. After reviewing your arguments and the information at issue, we agree the marked information constitutes privileged attorney-client communications the city may withhold under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. The city may withhold the information you have marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

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.

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](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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Jennifer Burnett", followed by a horizontal line extending to the right.

Jennifer Burnett  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JB/tch

Ref: ID# 470366

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)