



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 19, 2005

Ms. Carol Longoria  
Public Information Coordinator  
The University of Texas System  
201 West 7th Street  
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2005-09486

Dear Ms. Longoria:

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# 234531.

The University of Texas System (the "system") received a request for any complaints concerning the management and operations of the system audit office received by the system administration in 2005. You state the system has released one responsive complaint. However, you claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.116, and 552.137 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. The common law informer's privilege, incorporated into the Act by section 552.101, has long been recognized by Texas courts. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969); *Hawthorne v. State*, 10 S.W.2d 724, 725 (Tex. Crim. App. 1928). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law enforcement authority, provided that the subject of the information does not already know the informer's identity. Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1-2 (1978). The privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or

criminal penalties to “administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres.” Open Records Decision No. 279 at 2 (1981) (citing Wigmore, Evidence, § 2374, at 767 (McNaughton rev. ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. See Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4-5 (1988). The informer’s privilege does not, however, apply to information that does not describe alleged illegal conduct. Open Records Decision No. 515 at 5 (1988). In addition, the privilege excepts the informer’s statement only to the extent necessary to protect that informer’s identity. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990).

In this instance, all of the submitted complaints were made to the system’s Vice Chancellor for Administration (the “vice chancellor”) and pertain to the system’s audit office. However, you have not explained that any of the complaints allege illegal conduct carrying civil or criminal penalties over which the vice chancellor has a duty of inspection or law enforcement authority. See Gov’t Code §§ 552.301, .302; Open Records Decision Nos. 542 (1990) (stating that governmental body has burden of establishing that exception applies to requested information), 532 (1989), 515 (1988), 252 (1980). Accordingly, none of the submitted information is protected by the common law informer’s privilege.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of common law privacy. Common law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication 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, 685 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included 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. 540 S.W.2d at 683.

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.*

In this instance, part of the submitted complaints make allegations of sexual harassment. Because there is no adequate summary of the complaints or any resulting investigation, you must release this information. However, based on *Ellen*, the system must withhold the

identities of the victim and witnesses to the alleged sexual harassment. We have marked the information in the submitted complaint that must be withheld in accordance with *Ellen*.

Additionally, this office has found that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are excepted from required public disclosure under common law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). Thus, the system was withhold the medical information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with common law privacy.

We now address your claim that one submitted document is excepted by section 552.116 of the Government Code. Section 552.116 provides:

(a) An audit working paper of an audit of the state auditor or the auditor of a state agency, an institution of higher education as defined by Section 61.003, Education Code, a county, or a municipality is excepted from [public disclosure]. If information in an audit working paper is also maintained in another record, that other record is not excepted from [public disclosure] by this section.

(b) In this section:

(1) 'Audit' means an audit authorized or required by a statute of this state or the United States and includes an investigation.

(2) 'Audit working paper' includes all information, documentary or otherwise, prepared or maintained in conducting an audit or preparing an audit report, including:

(A) intra-agency and interagency communications; and

(B) drafts of the audit report or portions of those drafts.

Gov't Code § 552.116. You state the system is an institution of higher education as defined by section 61.003 of the Education Code. You explain the document at issue was created by a system auditor for purposes of an internal audit of the system prepared pursuant to Chapter 2102 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 2102.007 (relating to the duties of an internal auditor). You further state that the audit at issue was authorized under chapter 321 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 321.0136 ("An investigation is an inquiry into specified acts or allegations of impropriety, malfeasance, or nonfeasance in the obligation, expenditure, receipt, or use of state funds, or into specified financial transactions or practices that may involve such impropriety, malfeasance, or nonfeasance."). Based on your representations and our review, we agree that section 552.116 of the Government Code

is applicable to the document at issue. We therefore conclude that the department may withhold this marked document pursuant to section 552.116.

The submitted complaints also include the anonymous complainant's e-mail address, as well as other private e-mail addresses. Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body" unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). See Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). We note that section 552.137 does not apply to a government employee's work e-mail address because such an address is not that of the employee as a "member of the public" but is instead the address of the individual as a government employee. The complainant's e-mail address and the other private e-mail addresses are not of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Therefore, the system must withhold these e-mail addresses, which we have marked, in accordance with section 552.137 unless the system receives consent for their release.

In summary, the system must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to common law privacy under section 552.101 of the Government Code. The marked audit working paper may be withheld under section 552.116 of the Government Code. The marked e-mail addresses must be withheld under section 552.137. The remaining information at issue must be released.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Ramsey A. Abarca  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RAA/krl

Ref: ID# 234531

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Zachary Warmbrodt  
2405 Rio Grande Street #9  
Austin, Texas 78705  
(w/o enclosures)