



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

August 21, 2013

Ms. Linda Pemberton  
Paralegal  
Office of the City Attorney  
City of Killeen  
P.O. Box 1329  
Killeen, Texas 76540-1329

OR2013-14615

Dear Ms. Pemberton:

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# 497296 (Killeen W010771).

The Killeen Police Department (the "department") received a request for several categories of information pertaining to a named officer. You claim 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 representative samples of information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(1) provides for the required public disclosure of "a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body[.]" unless it is excepted by section 552.108 of the Government Code or "made confidential under [the Act] or other law[.]" Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Exhibit E contains completed evaluations and observation reports which are subject to section 552.022(a)(1) and must be released unless they are either excepted under

---

<sup>1</sup>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.

section 552.108 of the Government Code or are confidential under the Act or other law. Although you raise section 552.103 of the Government Code for this information, section 552.103 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *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); Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Accordingly, the department may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103. However, as section 552.101 of the Government Code makes information confidential under the Act, we will consider the applicability of this exception to the information that is subject to section 552.022. We will also consider your argument under section 552.103 of the Government Code for the remaining information in Exhibit E that is not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

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 Government Code. You state the City of Killeen 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 (2000) (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 at issue in Exhibit D is held in the department's internal file under section 143.089(g). Based on your representation, we agree that Exhibit D is confidential under section 143.089(g) of the Local Government Code and, therefore, must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

Section 552.103 provides, in part, as follows:

(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 that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.103 has the burden of providing relevant facts and documentation sufficient to establish the applicability of this exception to the information that it seeks to withhold. To meet this burden, the governmental body must demonstrate that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date of its receipt of the request for information and (2) the information at issue is related to the pending or anticipated litigation. *See Univ.*

---

<sup>2</sup>We note section 143.089(g) requires the department to "refer to the [civil service] director or the director's designee a person or agency that requests information that is maintained in [a] police officer's personnel file." Local Gov't Code § 143.089(g). You state the director of civil service for the City of Killeen (the "city") is also the director of human resources. You explain that "because all records are in the possession of the City of Killeen and the city attorney's office would ultimately have to assist the civil service director in responding, the requestor has not been referred to the director of civil service so as to minimize delay." Thus, we understand you are responding to the present request for information on behalf of both the department and the civil service director.

*of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.). Both elements of the test must be met in order for information to be excepted from disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990).

To demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the 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. *Id.* We note that 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983). In Open Records Decision 638 (1996), this office stated that, when a governmental body receives a notice of claim letter, it can meet its burden of showing that litigation is reasonably anticipated by representing that the notice of claim letter is in compliance with the requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act (the “TTCA”), Civil Practice and Remedies Code, chapter 101, or an applicable municipal ordinance. If that representation is not made, the receipt of the claim letter is a factor we will consider in determining, from the totality of the circumstances presented, whether the governmental body has established litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* ORD 638 at 4.

You state, and provide documentation showing, that prior to date the department received the present request for information, the requestor sent the department a letter stating the unauthorized use of his client’s motor vehicle might be a violation of law and the information is being requested so the requestor may make an informed decision on how to proceed. Based on our review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the requestor has taken any concrete steps toward the initiation of litigation against the department. Furthermore, although you argue the requestor sent the department letters which were in compliance with the TTCA, we find these letters were received by the department after the instant request for information. Therefore, we find you have failed to demonstrate the department reasonably anticipated litigation on the date the department received the request for information. Accordingly, we conclude the department may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law 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). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. This office has found that personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) (public employee’s withholding allowance certificate, designation of beneficiary of employee’s retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and employee’s decisions regarding voluntary benefits programs, among others, protected under common-law privacy). However, there is a legitimate public interest in the essential

facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9 (information revealing that employee participates in group insurance plan funded partly or wholly by governmental body is not excepted from disclosure), 545 (1990) (financial information pertaining to receipt of funds from governmental body or debts owed to governmental body not protected by common-law privacy). Furthermore, this office has noted the public has a legitimate interest in information relating to those who are involved in law enforcement. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel file information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 470 at 4 (job performance does not generally constitute public employee's private affairs), 444 at 3 (1986) (public has obvious interest in information concerning qualifications and performance of law enforcement employees), 405 at 2 (1983) (manner in which public employee's job was performed cannot be said to be of minimal public interest), 329 (1982) (reasons for employee's resignation ordinarily not private). Upon review, we find you have not demonstrated how the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not a matter of legitimate public concern. Accordingly, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the department must withhold the information at issue in Exhibit D under section 552.101 Government Code in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Thana Hussaini  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TH/som

Ref: ID# 497296

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)