



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

August 8, 2011

Ms. Jessica L. Saldivar  
Assistant General Counsel  
Houston Community College  
3100 Main Street  
Houston, Texas 77002

OR2011-11426

Dear Ms. Saldivar:

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# 427260.

Houston Community College (the "college") received a request for the transcript from a named individual's appeal hearing. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.102 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." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law right of privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be established. *Id.* at 681-82. The type of information considered intimate or 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. However, the public generally has a legitimate interest in information relating to public employment and public employees, particularly those involved in law enforcement. *See* Open Records Decision No. 444 at 6 (1986) (public has genuine interest

in information concerning law enforcement employee's qualifications and performance and circumstances of his termination or resignation).

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. We note that supervisors are generally not witnesses for purposes of *Ellen*, except where their statements appear in a non-supervisory context. Further, 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 a portion of the submitted information pertains to an investigation of sexual harassment. Furthermore, we find this information does not contain an adequate summary of the sexual harassment investigation. Because there is no adequate summary of the investigation, any information pertaining to the sexual harassment investigation must generally be released. However, the information at issue contains the identity of the alleged sexual harassment victim. Accordingly, we conclude the college must withhold the information we have indicated pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. However, none of the remaining information pertains to a sexual harassment investigation, and the college may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis. Further, you have failed to demonstrate any portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public interest. Accordingly, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.101 also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy, which consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy," which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than under the common-law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Tex.*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). In this instance, you have not demonstrated how constitutional privacy applies to any of the remaining information. Accordingly, the college may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

You claim the remaining submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.102 of the Government Code. 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 has 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. Upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.102(a). Accordingly, the college may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.102(a).

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a peace officer, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 or 552.1175 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> Act of May 24, 2011, 82nd Leg., R.S., S.B. 1638, § 2 (to be codified as an amendment to Gov't Code § 552.117(a)).

---

<sup>1</sup>The 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).

Section 552.117(a)(2) adopts the definition of peace officer found at article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. In this instance, it is unclear whether the employees at issue are currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12. Thus, to the extent the employees are currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12, the college must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. If the employees are not currently licensed peace officers, their personal information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

If the employees are not currently licensed peace officers, then their personal information may be subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024. Act of May 24, 2011, 82nd Leg., R.S., S.B. 1638, § 2 (to be codified as an amendment to Gov't Code § 552.117(a)). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may only be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Therefore, to the extent the employees at issue timely elected confidentiality under section 552.024, the college must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. If the employees at issue did not timely elect to keep their personal information confidential, the indicated personal information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1).

---

In summary, the college must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. To the extent the employees are currently licensed peace officers, the college must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. If the employees at issue are not currently licensed peace officers, the college must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code to the extent the employees at issue timely elected confidentiality under section 552.024 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 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sarah Casterline", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Sarah Casterline  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

SEC/eb

Ref: ID# 427260

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---