ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 11, 2008

Mr. Ricardo Gonzalez
Interim City Attorney
City of Edinburg
P.O. Box 1079
Edinburg, Texas 78540

OR2008-07968

Dear Mr. Gonzalez:

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# 312704.

The City of Edinburg (the "city") received a request for information regarding a specified investigation involving the requestor. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.103 of the Government Code.[1] We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which provides in pertinent part as follows:

> (a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

[1]Although we understand you to also raise section 552.107 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure, you have provided no arguments explaining how the attorney-client privilege is applicable to the submitted information. Therefore, we will not address this exception to disclosure. Gov't Code § 552.301, .302.

> (1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). In this instance, the submitted information is part of a completed investigation made by and for the city. This information must be released under section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or expressly confidential under other law. Although you raise section 552.103 of the Government Code for this information, this exception is discretionary under the Act, and does not constitute "other law" for purposes of section 552.022. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision No. 542 at 4 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.103 may be waived). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.103. Because information that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1) may be withheld under mandatory exceptions, we will consider your claim under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

You assert that the submitted information is excepted under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.,* 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The types 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. *Id.* 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. *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.* 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 and witnesses of the alleged sexual harassment must be redacted, and

their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 393 (1983), 339 (1982). We also note that supervisors are generally not witnesses for purposes of *Ellen*, except where their statements appear in a non-supervisory context.

The submitted information contains an adequate summary of an investigation into alleged sexual harassment. The summary is thus not confidential; however, information within the summary identifying the alleged victim and witnesses, which we have marked, is confidential under common-law privacy and must be withheld pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. The city must release the remaining information in the summary to the requestor. The remaining submitted information must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See id.*

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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,

Amy L.S. Shipp
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ALS/jb

Ref: ID# 312704

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Carlos Carrizales
17261 Dillion Road
Edinburg, Texas 78539
(w/o enclosures)