



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 17, 2011

Ms. Beth Vidaurri
Public Information Officer
Corpus Christi Regional Transportation Authority
5658 Bear Lane
Corpus Christi, Texas 78405

OR2011-08676

Dear Ms. Vidaurri:

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# 422202.

The Corpus Christi Regional Transportation Authority (the "authority") received a request for fourteen categories of records pertaining to the requestor and another named employee. You state the authority has released most of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.102 and 552.130 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 disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision."¹ Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 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 (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

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

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 "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). 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 note that since 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). We note supervisors are generally not witnesses for purposes of *Ellen*, except where their statements appear in a non-supervisory context.

The submitted information does not contain an adequate summary of the sexual harassment investigation. However, the submitted information contains the identities of the alleged sexual harassment victim and witnesses. Accordingly, we conclude the authority must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. The remaining information does not constitute highly intimate or embarrassing information of no legitimate public interest. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy under *Ellen*.

Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a). You assert the privacy analysis under section 552.102(a) is the same as the common-law privacy test under section 552.101, which is discussed above. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers, Inc.*, 652 S.W.2d 546, 549-51 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled the privacy test under section 552.102(a) is the same as the *Industrial Foundation* privacy test. However, the Texas Supreme Court recently expressly disagreed with *Hubert's* interpretation of section 552.102(a) and held its privacy standard differs from the *Industrial Foundation* test under section 552.101. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, No. 08-0172, 2010 WL 4910163, at *5 (Tex. Dec. 3, 2010). The supreme court then considered the applicability of section 552.102, and held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas

Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Id.* at *10. Having carefully reviewed the remaining information, we find the authority must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides that information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title, or registration issued by a Texas agency is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1), (2). Upon review, we find the authority must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information we have marked in the remaining information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.²

In summary, the authority must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. The authority must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The authority must withhold the Texas motor vehicle record information we have marked in the remaining information under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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 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,



Sean Nottingham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SN/bs

²We note this office issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including a Texas driver's license number under section 552.130 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

Ms. Beth Vidaurri - Page 4

Ref: ID# 422202

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)