



August 8, 2000

Mr. Tony Resendez
Escamilla & Poneck, Inc.
Attorneys and Counselors
1200 South Texas Building
603 Navarro Street
San Antonio, Texas 78205-1826

OR2000-3008

Dear Mr. Resendez:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 137848.

The South San Antonio Independent School District (the "school district"), which you represent, received a request for a copy of the investigation report regarding allegations of sexual harassment and an investigation report about allegations of two unauthorized phone calls made by a school district employee. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception 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." Section 552.101 encompasses information considered confidential under the common law right to privacy. Information is protected by the common law right to privacy if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977).

In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.--El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of the common law privacy doctrine to files regarding an investigation of allegations of sexual harassment. The investigation files in *Ellen* contained individual witness statements, an affidavit by the individual accused of the misconduct responding to the allegations, and conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. *Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating that

the public's interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* In concluding, the *Ellen* court held that "the public did not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements beyond what is contained in the documents that have been ordered released." *Id.*

According to *Ellen*, the public has a legitimate interest in documents that adequately summarize sexual harassment allegations and the results of investigations into those allegations, but not in the identities or detailed statements of the victim and witnesses. *See id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 473 (1987), 470 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job performance of public employees). The documents you have submitted to this office do not contain a summary of the sexual harassment allegations and the results of the investigation into those allegations. Because there is no such summary to satisfy the public interest in this matter, we find that there remains a legitimate public interest in the detailed statements and other investigation materials.¹ Therefore, the school district must release the submitted documents to the requestor. However, section 552.101 in conjunction with *Ellen* requires the school district to withhold the witnesses' and the victim's identifying information. We have marked the types of information in the submitted documents that the school district must redact under section 552.101.

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

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the

¹Because the investigation into the allegations of unauthorized phone calls relates to the investigation into the sexual harassment allegations, we consider both investigations to be subject to *Ellen* and, therefore, to be of legitimate interest to the public.

governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



E. Joanna Fitzgerald
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EJF\lr

Ref: ID# 137848

Encl: Submitted documents

cc: Mr. Raymond De La Garza
810 Chalmers
San Antonio, Texas 78211
(w/o enclosures)