



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 5, 2003

Mr. Kuruvilla Oommen
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 1562
Houston, Texas 77251-1562

OR2003-8741

Dear Mr. Oommen:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 192046.

The Houston Police Department (the "department") received two requests for information related to a specified sexual harassment investigation. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.117, and 552.130 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions 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 the doctrine of common-law privacy. For information to be protected by common-law privacy it must meet the criteria set out in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). The *Industrial Foundation* court stated that information is excepted from disclosure 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. 540 S.W.2d at 685.

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 of 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.*

The submitted investigation contains information that we find to be analogous to the summary released in *Ellen*, as well as the respondents’ statements. In accordance with the holding in *Ellen*, the department must release the summary and statements, which we have marked. However, before releasing these documents, the department must redact the information we have marked that identifies the complainant and witnesses. All other submitted information, including individual complainant and witness statements as well as other supporting documentary evidence, must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in accordance with the common-law privacy concerns expressed in *Ellen*.

Additionally, section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(1)*. However, information subject to section 552.117(a)(1) may not be withheld from disclosure if the current or former employee made the request for confidentiality under section 552.024 after the request for information at issue was received by the governmental body. Whether a particular piece of information is public must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989)*. For employees who timely elected to keep their personal information confidential, we agree that you must redact their personal information from the respondents’ statements. The department may not redact this information under section 552.117(a)(1) for employees who did not make a timely election to keep this information confidential.

Also, section 552.130 of the Government Code prohibits the release of information that relates to a motor vehicle operator’s or driver’s license or permit issued by an agency of this state or a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state. *See Gov’t Code § 552.130*. Accordingly, the department must redact the respondents’ Texas driver’s license information from their statements pursuant to section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Finally, we note that under section 552.023 of the Government Code a person or a person’s authorized representative has a special right of access to records that contain information relating to the person that are protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person’s privacy interests. Therefore, each requestor has a special right of access to her individual section 552.117 and 552.130 information, and it must be released to them in this instance.

In summary, the department must withhold the submitted information except for the summary and the respondents’ statements, both of which must be disclosed pursuant to

Morales v. Ellen, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.--El Paso 1992, writ denied). However, the identities and statements of the victims and witnesses to the alleged sexual harassment are protected by the common-law privacy doctrine and must be redacted from those documents. Further, we conclude that, for employees who timely elected to keep their personal information confidential, the department must redact their section 552.117 information. Also, the department must redact the respondents' section 552.130 information. However, each requestor has a special right of access to her individual section 552.117 and 552.130 information pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code, and it must be released to them in this instance.

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 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 Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. 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,



W. Montgomery Meitler
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

WMM/lmt

Ref: ID# 192046

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Wanda Milburn
2030 DeWalt Street
Houston, Texas 77088
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Tina D. Johnson
3229 Cliffmarshall Street
Houston, Texas 77088
(w/o enclosures)