



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 2, 2004

Ms. Elaine S. Hengen
Assistant City Attorney
City of El Paso
2 Civic Center Plaza, 9th Floor
El Paso, Texas 79901

OR2004-6491

Dear Ms. Hengen:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 206208.

The El Paso Police Department (the "department") received a request for complaints filed by two named individuals against interim police Chief Richard Wiles. You claim that information relating to the second complaint is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and have reviewed the information you submitted. You inform us that the department has asked the requestor for clarification regarding the first complaint.¹ You do not indicate that you have received a response to the request for clarification. Accordingly, the department has no further obligation at this time with regard to any information that may be responsive to the request for the first complaint. At such time, however, as the requestor provides clarification, the department must request a decision from this office with regard to any responsive information relating to the first complaint that the department seeks to withhold. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

Section 552.101 excepts from required public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code

¹*See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (if what information is requested is unclear to governmental body, it may ask requestor to clarify request); Open Records Decision No. 663 at 2-5 (1999) (addressing circumstances under which governmental body's communications with requestor to clarify or narrow request for information toll its ten-business-day deadline to request decision under Gov't Code § 552.301(b)).

§ 552.101. This exception encompasses the common-law right to privacy. Information must be withheld from the public under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy when the information is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, and (2) of no legitimate public interest. See *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (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 applied the common-law right to privacy to an investigation of alleged sexual harassment. The investigation files at issue in *Ellen* contained third-party witness statements, an affidavit in which the individual accused of the misconduct responded to the allegations, and the conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. See 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court upheld the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating that the disclosure of such documents sufficiently served the public's interest in the matter. *Id.* The court also held, however, that “the public does 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.*

Thus, if there is an adequate summary of an investigation of alleged sexual harassment, the investigation summary must be released under *Ellen*, but the identities of the victims of and witnesses to the alleged sexual harassment must be redacted, and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. See also Open Records Decision Nos. 393 (1983), 339 (1982). If no adequate summary of the investigation exists, then all of the information relating to the investigation must ordinarily be released, except for information that would identify the victims and witnesses. In either case, the identity of the individual accused of sexual harassment is not protected from public disclosure. Common-law privacy does not protect information about a public employee's alleged misconduct on the job or complaints made about a public employee's job performance. See Open Records Decision Nos. 438 (1986), 405 (1983), 230 (1979), 219 (1978).

In this instance, the submitted information involves allegations of sexual harassment. However, the information does not include an adequate summary of any investigation of these claims. Therefore, under *Morales v. Ellen*, only the information that identifies the victim of the alleged sexual harassment is protected by common-law privacy. We have marked that information, which the department must withhold under section 552.101.

Common-law privacy under section 552.101 also protects the specific types of information that the Texas Supreme Court held to be intimate or embarrassing in *Industrial Foundation*. See 540 S.W.2d at 683 (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). This office has since concluded that other types of information also are private under section 552.101. See Open Records Decision Nos. 659 at 4-5 (1999) (summarizing information attorney general has held to be private), 470 at 4 (1987) (illness from severe emotional job-related stress), 455 at 9 (1987)

(prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), 343 at 1-2 (1982) (references in emergency medical records to drug overdose, acute alcohol intoxication, obstetrical/gynecological illness, convulsions/seizures, or emotional/mental distress), 393 at 2 (1983) (identity of victim of sexual offense). We have marked information that the department must withhold under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy under *Industrial Foundation*.

Section 552.101 also encompasses information that another statute makes confidential. You raise section 552.101 in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code. Chapter 261 of the Family Code is applicable to reports and investigations of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect. Section 261.201(a) provides as follows:

(a) The following information is confidential, is not subject to public release under Chapter 552, Government Code, and may be disclosed only for purposes consistent with this code and applicable federal or state law or under rules adopted by an investigating agency:

(1) a report of alleged or suspected abuse or neglect made under this chapter and the identity of the person making the report; and

(2) except as otherwise provided in this section, the files, reports, records, communications, and working papers used or developed in an investigation under this chapter or in providing services as a result of an investigation.

Fam. Code § 261.201(a). We find that the information that you claim is confidential under section 261.201(a) does not constitute a report of alleged or suspected child abuse or neglect made under chapter 261 of the Family Code or a file, report, record, communication, or working paper used or developed in an investigation under chapter 261 or in providing services as a result of an investigation. We therefore conclude that the department may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 261.201 of the Family Code.

Next, we address your claim under section 552.103. This exception provides in part:

(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). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents sufficient to establish the applicability of section 552.103 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 reasonably anticipated litigation. *See University of Tex. Law Sch. v. Texas 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).*

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986).* To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office with “concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture.” *Id.*² This office has concluded that a governmental body’s receipt of a claim letter that it represents to be in compliance with the notice requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act, chapter 101 of the Civil Practice and Remedies Code, is sufficient to establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. If that representation is not made, the receipt of the claim letter is a factor that we will consider in determining, from the totality of the circumstances presented, whether the governmental body has established that litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See Open Records Decision No. 638 at 4 (1996).*

You assert that a portion of the submitted information relates to an incident that is the subject of anticipated litigation. You inform us that the city has received a notice of tort claim concerning the incident in question. You inform us that the claim is in compliance with the notice requirements of the Texas Tort Claims Act and applicable ordinances of the City of El Paso. You have submitted a copy of the claim letter. We note that the claim is asserted against the city, the department, and officers and employees of the department. Based on your representations and the submitted documentation, we find that you have demonstrated

²Among other examples, this office has concluded that litigation was reasonably anticipated where the opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: (1) filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (“EEOC”), *see Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982)*; (2) hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982)*; and (3) threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981)*.

that the department reasonably anticipated litigation on the date of its receipt of this request for information. We therefore conclude that you may withhold the marked information that relates to the anticipated litigation under section 552.103.

In reaching this conclusion, we assume that the opposing parties in the anticipated litigation have not seen or had access to any of the information that you seek to withhold under section 552.103. The purpose of this exception is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information that relates to the litigation through discovery procedures. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4-5 (1990). If the opposing parties have seen or had access to information that relates to anticipated litigation, through discovery or otherwise, then there is no interest in withholding that information from public disclosure under section 552.103. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Furthermore, the applicability of section 552.103 ends when the related litigation concludes or is no longer reasonably anticipated. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

You also raise section 552.117. Section 552.117(a)(2) excepts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, and social security number of a peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 or 552.1175. Section 552.117(a)(2) adopts the definition of peace officer found at article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. You inform us that you have marked information relating to peace officers that is excepted from disclosure under section 552.117. Based on your representation, we have marked the submitted information that must be withheld under section 552.117(a)(2).

In summary: (1) the department must withhold the information that is confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy; (2) the department may withhold the information that relates to the anticipated litigation under section 552.103; and (3) the department must withhold the information that is excepted from disclosure under section 552.117(a)(2). The rest of the submitted information must be released. As we are able to make these determinations, we need not address your other arguments against disclosure.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "James W. Morris, III", with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

James W. Morris, III
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JWM/sdk

Ref: ID# 206208

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Daniel Borunda
El Paso Times
P.O. Box 20
El Paso, Texas 79901
(w/o enclosures)