



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

March 22, 2013

Ms. Julia Gannaway  
Counsel for the City of Hewitt  
Lynn Ross Smith & Gannaway, L.L.P.  
306 West Broadway Avenue  
Fort Worth, Texas 76104

OR2013-04752

Dear Ms. Ganaway:

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# 481918.

The Hewitt Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for complaints, performance evaluations, internal affairs investigations, disciplinary investigations, or disciplinary actions pertaining to four named department officers. You claim some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102, and 552.117 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses section 143.089 of the Local

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you also raise section 552.1175 of the Government Code for some of the submitted information, we note section 552.117 of the Government Code is the proper exception to raise in this instance because the department holds the information at issue in an employment capacity.

<sup>2</sup>We assume 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.

Government Code. You state the City of Hewitt is a civil service city under chapter 143 of the Local Government Code. Section 143.089 provides for the existence of two different types of personnel files relating to a police officer: 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 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 Local Gov't Code chapter 143). 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 police 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). However, a document relating to a police officer's alleged misconduct may not be placed in his civil service 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 Gen.*, 851 S.W.2d 946, 949 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied).

You state the information in Exhibits B-E are maintained in the department's internal file of the officers at issue. You also state that disciplinary action under chapter 143 was not taken against the named officers as a result of these investigations. *See* Local Gov't Code §§ 143.051, .055. Based on your representations and our review, we find Exhibits B-E are

confidential and the department must withhold them under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The type of information considered intimate or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental 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 are excepted from required public disclosure 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). We note that the fact that a public employee is sick is public information, but specific information about illnesses is excepted from disclosure. *See* ORD 470 at 4.

Upon review, we find the information we have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department has failed to demonstrate, however, how the remaining information it has marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Therefore, the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining information it has marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.102 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwanted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). We understand you assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101, which is noted above. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. *In Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref’d n.r.e.), the Third Court of Appeals ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court expressly disagreed with *Hubert’s* interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held its privacy standard differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *See Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336, 348 (Tex. 2010). The Supreme Court then considered the applicability of section 552.102, and held section 552.102(a)

---

<sup>3</sup>We note section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code requires a police department that receives a request for information maintained in a file under section 143.089(g) to refer the requestor to the civil service director or the director’s designee.

excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *See id.* at 346. Upon review, we find none of the remaining information is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code and none of it may be withheld on that basis.

You assert some of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.117 of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure a peace officer's home address and telephone number, social security number, emergency contact information, and family member information regardless of whether the peace officer made an election under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

In summary, the department must withhold Exhibits B-E under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code. The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. 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.

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,



Jennifer Luttrall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JL/som

Ref: ID# 481918

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)