



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 22, 2011

Ms. Catherine L. Clifton  
Senior Assistant City Attorney  
Odessa Police Department  
205 North Grant  
Odessa, Texas 79761

OR2011-08912

Dear Ms. Clifton:

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# 421703.

The City of Odessa (the "city") received a request for a specified internal investigation by the Odessa Police Department. You claim 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.

Initially, we address the city's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Section 552.301(b) requires a governmental body to ask for the attorney general's decision and claim its exceptions to disclosure not later than the tenth business day after the date of its receipt of the written request for information. *See id.* § 552.301(b). Section 552.301(e) provides a governmental body must submit to this office, not later than the fifteenth business day after the date of its receipt of the request, (1) written comments stating why the governmental body's claimed exceptions apply to the information that it seeks to withhold; (2) a copy of the written request for information; (3) a signed statement of the date on which the governmental body received the request or evidence sufficient to establish that date; and (4) the specific information the governmental body seeks to withhold or representative samples if the information is voluminous. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A)-(D). You state the city received the request on April 5, 2011. Accordingly, the city's ten-business-day deadline was April 19, 2011, and the city's fifteen-business-day deadline was April 26, 2011. The city did

not submit its request for a ruling from this office until April 20, 2011 and did not submit comments explaining why the stated exceptions apply or a copy or representative sample of the information requested until April 28, 2011. *See id.* § 552.308 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Consequently, we find the city failed to comply with the requirements of subsections 552.301(b) and (e).

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of the Act results in the legal presumption the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). The presumption information is public under section 552.302 can be overcome by demonstrating that the information is confidential by law or third-party interests are at stake. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 3 (1994), 325 at 2 (1982). Because section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to overcome this presumption, we will consider your argument for withholding 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.” Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses the doctrine of common-law 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). In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court addressed the applicability of common-law privacy to information relating to an investigation of alleged 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. *See 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 the public's interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* 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 sexual harassment, the summary must be released along with the statement of the person accused of sexual harassment, but the identities of the victims and witnesses must be redacted and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. If no adequate summary of the investigation exists, then detailed statements regarding the allegations must be released, but the identities of victims and witnesses must be redacted from the statements. In either event, the identity of the

individual accused of sexual harassment is not protected from public disclosure. We note supervisors are generally not witnesses for purposes of *Ellen*, except where their statements appear in a non-supervisory context.

The submitted information consists of a sexual harassment investigation. In this instance, the submitted documents include a summary of the investigation. We note the summary reveals the identity of the alleged victim of sexual harassment and the witnesses in the investigation. The summary is not confidential under common-law privacy. However, the city must withhold the identifying information of the victim and witnesses in the summary, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the decision in *Ellen*. The city must release the remaining portions of the summary. The city must withhold the rest of the submitted investigation under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the decision in *Ellen*.

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](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/em

Ref: ID# 421703

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)