



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

August 26, 2004

Mr. Brendan Hall  
City Attorney  
City of Harlingen  
P. O. Box 2207  
Harlingen, Texas 78551

OR2004-7315

Dear Mr. Hall:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 208134.

The City of Harlingen (the "city") received two requests from different requestors for information relating to a specified investigation, certain city police department ("department") policies and procedures, and a named individual. You state that you have provided one of the requestors with some of the requested information. You claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and have reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides:

(a) Information held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

- (1) release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime;
- (2) it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication;
- (3) it is information relating to a threat against a peace officer collected or disseminated under Section 411.048; or

(4) it is information that:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

(b) An internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution is excepted from [required public disclosure] if:

(1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution;

(2) the internal record or notation relates to law enforcement only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication; or

(3) the internal record or notation:

(A) is prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation; or

(B) reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

(c) This section does not except [from public disclosure] information that is basic information about an arrested person, an arrest, or a crime.

Gov't Code § 552.108. Generally speaking, subsections 552.108(a)(1) and 552.108(b)(1) are mutually exclusive of subsections 552.108(a)(2) and 552.108(b)(2). Subsection 552.108(a)(1) protects information, the release of which would interfere with a particular pending criminal investigation or prosecution, while subsection 552.108(b)(1) encompasses internal law enforcement and prosecution records, the release of which would interfere with on-going law enforcement and prosecution efforts in general. In contrast, subsections 552.108(a)(2) and (b)(2) protect information that relates to a concluded criminal investigation or prosecution that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication. Subsection 552.108(a)(3) is applicable to information collected or disseminated under section 411.048 of the Government Code. Subsections 552.108(a)(4) and 552.108(b)(3) are applicable to information that was prepared by an attorney representing the state in anticipation of or in the course of preparing for criminal litigation or that reflects the mental impressions or legal reasoning of an attorney representing the state.

We note that a governmental body that claims an exception to disclosure under section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why this exception is applicable to the information that the governmental body seeks to withhold. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977); Open Records Decision No. 434 at 2-3 (1986). You indicate that the submitted information concerns an ongoing internal affairs investigation that is being conducted by the department to determine whether or not the named individual sexually harassed another individual. We note, however, that section 552.108 is generally not applicable to investigatory records that are purely administrative in nature. *See City of Fort Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no pet.); *see also Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable where no criminal investigation or prosecution of police officer resulted from investigation of allegation of sexual harassment); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982) (predecessor provision of section 552.108 not applicable to Internal Affairs Division investigation file when no criminal charge against officer results from investigation of complaint against police officer). We further note that you do not argue, nor does it appear, that this ongoing internal affairs investigation resulted in any criminal investigation into the alleged conduct of the named individual. Thus, after carefully reviewing your arguments and the submitted information, we find that the city has failed to adequately demonstrate how or why any aspect of section 552.108 is applicable to any portion of the submitted information. Consequently, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on that basis.

We note, however, that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy.<sup>1</sup> Information is protected from disclosure by the common-law right to privacy if it is highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and is of no legitimate concern to the public. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 683-85 (Tex. 1976). 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 investigatory files at issue in *Ellen* contained individual witness and victim statements, an affidavit given by the individual accused of the misconduct in response to the allegations, and the conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. The court held that the names of witnesses and their detailed affidavits regarding allegations of sexual harassment are exactly the types of information specifically excluded from disclosure under the privacy doctrine as described in *Industrial Foundation*. *See Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. However, the court ordered the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation. *See id.* The *Ellen* court also ordered the disclosure of the summary of the investigation with the identities of the victims and witnesses deleted from

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information that is protected from disclosure by the common-law right to privacy.

the documents, noting that the public interest in the matter was sufficiently served by disclosure of such documents and that in that particular instance “the public [did] not possess a legitimate interest in the identities of the individual witnesses, nor the details of their personal statements.” *Id.* Thus, when there is an adequate summary of an investigation, the summary and any statements of the person under investigation must be released, but the identities of the victims and witnesses must be redacted and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. However, when no adequate summary exists, detailed statements regarding the allegations must be released, but the identities of witnesses and victims must still be redacted from the statements.

In this instance, we find that none of the submitted documents constitutes an adequate summary of the investigation. We therefore conclude that the city must withhold the identifying information of the victim of the alleged sexual harassment that we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy.

In addition, we note that portions of the remaining submitted information are excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(2) excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, social security number, and family member information of a peace officer, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 or 552.1175 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> *See* Gov’t Code § 552.117(a)(2). Accordingly, we conclude that the city must withhold the information that we have marked pursuant to section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information that we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy and section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining submitted information to the requestor.

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

---

<sup>2</sup> Section 552.117(a)(2) adopts the definition of peace officer found at article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. *See* Crim. Proc. Code art. 2.12.

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,



Ronald J. Bounds  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RJB/krl

Ref: ID# 208134

Enc. Marked documents

c: Ms. Kimberly Gong  
Valley Morning Star  
1310 S. Commerce  
Harlingen, Texas 78550  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Sergio Chapa  
Valley Morning Star  
P. O. Box 511  
Harlingen, Texas 78551  
(w/o enclosures)