



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 11, 2010

Ms. Martha T. Williams
Olson & Olson L.L.P
Attorney for City of Sealy
Wortham Tower, Suite 600
2727 Allen Parkway
Houston, Texas 77019

OR2010-03537

Dear Ms. Williams:

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# 373379.

The City of Sealy (the "city"), which you represent, received four requests for a sexual harassment complaint against a captain with the city's police department. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, and 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments from one of the requestors. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we address your argument under section 552.103, as this is potentially the most encompassing exception you claim. Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides:

- (a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body claiming this exception bears the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to demonstrate the applicability of the exception. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To demonstrate that litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 555 (1990), 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). On the other hand, this office has determined if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish litigation is reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You state the complaint "is currently being investigated and may result in a lawsuit being filed." However, you do not inform us of any objective steps any party has made toward initiating litigation against the city. Thus, you have failed to establish that litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the city received the present requests for information. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.108 of the Government Code provides in relevant part as follows:

(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;

...

(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;

Gov't Code § 552.108(a)–(b). Section 552.108(a)(1) protects information, the release of which would interfere with a particular pending criminal investigation or prosecution, while section 552.108(b)(1) encompasses internal law enforcement and prosecution records, the release of which would interfere with ongoing law enforcement and prosecution efforts in general. 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 id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977).

Section 552.108 is generally not applicable to information relating to an administrative investigation that did not result in a criminal investigation or prosecution. *See Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519, 525-26 (Tex. Civ. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 not applicable to internal investigation that did not result in criminal investigation or prosecution); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 at 3-4 (1982). The submitted information consists of a sexual harassment complaint. You have not explained how this complaint is related to a criminal investigation. We find you have failed to show that release of the submitted information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.108(a)(1) of the Government Code. We also find you have failed to show that release of the complaint would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.108(b)(1).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code 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 common-law informer's privilege, which 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). It protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority. Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1988). The informer's 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). However, the informer's privilege does not apply where the informant's identity is known to the individual who is the subject of the complaint. See Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978).

In this instance, you fail to inform this office of any specific criminal or civil statute that the city believes to have been violated. Thus, as you have not demonstrated that the information in question pertains to an alleged violation of any specific criminal or civil law, none of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with the informer's privilege.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the common-law right of privacy, which protects information if it (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 addition, this office has found some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses is protected by 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).

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). 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.

As we noted above, the submitted information pertains to an allegation of sexual harassment. Because there is no adequate summary of the investigation, any requested documents relating to the sexual harassment investigation must be released, with the identities of victims and witnesses redacted pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. We note that supervisors are not witnesses for purposes of *Ellen*, and thus, supervisors' identities may generally not be withheld. After reviewing the submitted complaint, we have marked the information identifying victims and witnesses of alleged sexual harassment. The city must withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, none of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest, and the city may not withhold it on this basis.

We note a portion of the remaining information is subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.¹ Section 552.117(a)(2) excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information regarding a peace officer regardless of whether the officer requested confidentiality under section 552.024 or 552.1175 of the Government Code.² Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.117(a)(2).

In summary, the city must withhold the information identifying victims and witnesses of alleged sexual harassment we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding under *Ellen*. The city must withhold the personal information of a peace officer we have marked under section 552.117 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and

¹ The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

² "Peace officer" is defined by Article 2.12 of the Texas Code of Criminal Procedure.

responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Mack T. Harrison
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MTH/rl

Ref: ID# 373379

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestors (4)
(w/o enclosures)