



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

September 24, 2014

Mr. Brandon S. Shelby  
City Attorney  
City of Sherman  
P.O. Box 1106  
Sherman, Texas 75091

OR2014-16992

Dear Mr. Shelby:

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# 537146 (PIR No. OR-1514).

The City of Sherman (the "city") received a request for the personnel file of a named city police officer and information pertaining to any investigations and disciplinary actions regarding the officer. You state the city will redact information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government pursuant to section 552.024(c)(2) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup>Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.024(c)(2) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact information protected by section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting a decision under the Act if the current or former employee of official to whom the information pertains timely chooses not to allow public access to the information. *See id.* § 552.024(c)(2).

<sup>2</sup>We note the city did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). Nonetheless, because section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider its applicability to the submitted information. *See id.* §§ 552.007, 302, 352.

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 protected 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 relating to a police officer: 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). We note section 143.089(a) requires the civil service director to maintain a personnel file on each “police officer.” Likewise, section 143.089(g) states that a police department may maintain a personnel file on each “police officer.” Both sections refer to “police officer.” We note the individual whose information is at issue was hired by the city’s police department as a probationary officer. Section 143.003 defines a police officer as a member of a police department or other peace officer who was appointed in substantial compliance with chapter 143 or who is entitled to civil service status under other sections of chapter 143. *Id.* § 143.003(5). We understand the named officer was appointed in substantial compliance with chapter 143. Therefore, we agree the named officer was a “police officer” subject to chapter 143. 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)-(3).

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).<sup>3</sup> *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 police 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 an officer’s alleged misconduct may not be placed in his civil service personnel file if there is insufficient evidence to sustain the charge of

---

<sup>3</sup>Chapter 143 prescribes the following types of disciplinary actions: removal, suspension, demotion, and uncompensated duty. Local Gov’t Code §§ 143.051-.055; *see, e.g.*, Attorney General Opinion JC-0257 (2000) (written reprimand is not disciplinary action for purposes of Local Government Code chapter 143).

misconduct. Local Gov't Code § 143.089(b). In addition, a document relating to disciplinary action against a police officer that has been placed in the officer's personnel file as provided by section 143.089(a)(2) must be removed from the officer's file if the civil service commission finds the disciplinary action was taken without just cause or the charge of misconduct was not supported by sufficient evidence. *See id.* § 143.089(c). Information that reasonably relates to an 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. *See 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. Texas Attorney General*, 851 S.W.2d 946, 949 (Tex. App.—Austin 1993, writ denied).

You state the submitted information is maintained in the city's police department's internal file created pursuant to section 143.089(g). Based on your representation and our review, we conclude the city must withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 143.089(g) of the Local 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.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,



Britni Fabian  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BF/bhf

Ref: ID# 537146

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)