



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 31, 2012

Mr. Clark T. Askins
Askins & Askins, P.C.
P.O. Box 1218
La Porte, Texas 77572-1218

OR2012-01558

Dear Mr. Askins:

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# 444136.

The City of La Porte (the “city”), which you represent, received a request for a complaint filed against the requestor on a specified date. You claim that 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.

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 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 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. 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 pertains to a report of alleged sexual harassment. Upon review, we find the submitted information does not contain an adequate summary of the investigation. However, the submitted information contains the identities of the alleged sexual harassment victim and witnesses. Accordingly, we conclude the city 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 552.101 of the Government Code also 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). This privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority, provided the subject of the information does not already know the informer’s identity. Open Records Decision Nos. 515 at 3 (1988), 208 at 1-2 (1978). 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 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 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.

In this instance, the city has not informed us of any particular law or laws alleged to have been violated, nor demonstrated that any alleged violations would result in a civil or criminal penalty. Thus, we find that the city has not met its burden in adequately demonstrating that the informer's privilege is applicable to the submitted information. See Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(A); Open Records Decision Nos. 542 (1990) (concluding that Act places on governmental body burden of establishing why and how exception applies to requested information), 532 (1989), 515, 252 (1980). Consequently, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with the informer's privilege.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. 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, 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,



Sarah Casterline
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SEC/ag

Ref: ID# 444136

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)