



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

February 10, 2012

Mr. Warren M. S. Ernst  
Chief of the General Counsel Division  
Office of the City Attorney  
City of Dallas  
1500 Marilla Street, Room 7BN  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2012-02165

Dear Mr. Ernst:

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# 445034.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for a specified harassment complaint filed by a named individual. 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.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public 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 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 (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.

*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.* 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*, along with the statement of the accused. However, 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 victims and witnesses must still be redacted from the statements. In either case, the identity of the individual accused of sexual harassment is not protected from public disclosure. We also note supervisors are generally not witnesses for purposes of *Ellen*, except where their statements appear in a non-supervisory context.

The submitted information relates to an investigation into alleged sexual harassment. Upon review, we find the information at issue does not contain an adequate summary of the alleged sexual harassment. 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 identities of alleged sexual harassment victims and witnesses. Accordingly, 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*. *See Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. However, we find you have not demonstrated how any portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern, or the information pertains to an individual who has been de-identified and whose privacy interests are thus protected. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure, 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.ph](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.ph), 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 cursive script, appearing to read "Claire Morris Sloan". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the typed name.

Claire V. Morris Sloan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CVMS/agn

Ref: ID# 445034

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)