



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

August 13, 2008

Mr. Philip A. DeFriend
Assistant General Counsel
Texas Department of Criminal Justice
Office of the General Counsel
P.O. Box 4004
Huntsville, Texas 77342-4004

OR2008-11027

Dear Mr. DeFriend:

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# 319043.

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice (the "department") received a request from a former employee for his employment records, including a specified EEO investigation. You state that some responsive information has been released to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the common-law right of privacy, which 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. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (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 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.*

Thus, if there is an adequate summary of an investigation of alleged sexual harassment, the investigation summary must be released along with the statement of the accused 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). If no adequate summary of the investigation exists, then all of the information relating to the investigation ordinarily must be released, with the exception of information that would identify the victims and witnesses. Because 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, the identity of the individual accused of sexual harassment is not protected from public disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 438 (1986), 405 (1983), 230 (1979), 219 (1978).

The submitted information consists of an investigation pertaining to alleged sexual harassment. The information includes, among other things, an adequate summary of the investigation. The summary, which we have marked, is thus not confidential; however, information within the summary identifying the 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. Thus, with the exception of the summary, the department must withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and *Ellen*. The department must also withhold under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and *Ellen* the information we have marked in the summary that identifies the victim and witnesses.

In conclusion, with the exception of the summary, which we have marked, the department must withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and *Ellen*.¹ The department must also withhold under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and *Ellen* the information we have marked in the

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure.

summary that identifies the victim and witnesses. The remainder of the summary must be released.²

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). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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

²We note that the requestor has a right of access to some of the information being released pursuant to section 552.023. Gov't Code § 552.023 (person or person's authorized representative has special right of access to information relating to person and protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when person asks governmental body for information concerning the person himself or herself). If the department receives another request for this information from a different requestor without such a right of access, the department should resubmit this same information and request another ruling. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301; 302.

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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'B. Diener', enclosed within a circular scribble.

Benjamin A. Diener
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BAD/jb

Ref: ID# 319043

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Todd Babin, Jr.
106 Lazy Ridge Drive
Gatesville, Texas 76528
(w/o enclosures)