ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 29, 2007

Ms. Cary Grace
Assistant City Attorney
City of Austin
P.O. Box 1088
Austin, Texas 78767-8828

OR2007-11233

Dear Ms. Grace:

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#288425.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for the following: (1) specified HR notespertaining to a particular investigation; (2) specific notes taken by the requestor's boss; and (3) any records of a specified radio conversation between the requestor and a named individual. You state that there are no responsive documents with regard to requested item number (3).[1] You claim that the submitted 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," including information that is encompassed by the common law right to privacy. Gov't Code § 552.101; *see Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). Information is protected from disclosure under the common law right to privacy if (1) it contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the release of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) it is not of legitimate concern to the public. *See id.* 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

[1]We note the Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist when the request for information was received. *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. App.–San Antonio 1978, writ dism'd); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986).

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. *Id.* 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.*

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. We further note that supervisors are not witnesses for purposes of *Ellen*, and thus, supervisors' identities may generally not be withheld under section 552.101 and common law privacy.

You state, and provide documentation showing, that an adequate summary has been released to the requestor. In this instance, the requestor is the victim of the alleged sexual harassment, and therefore has a special right of access to the information contained in the released documents that implicates her privacy interests.[2] *See* Gov't Code § 552.023; Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual asks governmental body for information concerning herself). However, the responsive information constitutes the remainder of the sexual harassment investigation, and includes witness statements and other supporting documentary evidence. Upon review, we determine that this information must be withheld under sections 552.101 of the Government Code in accordance with the common law privacy concerns expressed in *Ellen*.

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

---

[2]Section 552.023(a) of the Government Code provides that "[a] person or a person's authorized representative has a special right of access, beyond the right of the general public, to information held by a governmental body that relates to the person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests."

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,

Holly R. Davis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

HRD/eeg

Ref: ID# 288425

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Erin La Rue
5602 Wellington Drive
Austin, Texas 78723
(w/o enclosures)