



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 15, 2012

Ms. Amy L. Sims
Assistant City Attorney
City of Lubbock
P.O. Box 2000
Lubbock, Texas 79457

OR2012-18428

Dear Ms. Sims:

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# 471761.

The City of Lubbock (the "city") received a request for a report pertaining to a specified investigation. You claim 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 common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which 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 satisfied. *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. You cite *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied), in your argument against disclosure based on section 552.101 in conjunction with

common-law privacy. In *Ellen*, the court addressed the applicability of the common-law privacy doctrine to files of an investigation of sexual harassment. 840 S.W.2d 519. 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. *Id.* 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 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. See Open Records Decision Nos. 562 at 10 (1990) (personnel information does not involve most intimate aspects of human affairs, but in fact touches on matters of legitimate public concern), 470 at 4 (job performance does not generally constitute public employee's private affairs), 444 at 3 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation of public employees), 423 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow), 405 at 2-3 (1983) (public has interest in manner in which public employee performs job), 329 at 2 (1982) (information relating to complaints against public employees and discipline resulting therefrom is not protected under former section 552.101), 208 at 2 (1978) (information relating to complaint against public employee and disposition of the complaint is not protected under common-law right of privacy). We note supervisors are generally not witnesses for purposes of *Ellen*, except where their statements appear in a non-supervisory context.

Upon review, we find *Morales v. Ellen* is applicable to the submitted information. We also find the submitted information constitutes an adequate summary of the investigation of sexual harassment. We note the summary reveals the identity of the alleged victim of sexual harassment. In this instance, the requestor is the alleged victim. As such, the requestor has a special right of access under section 552.023 of the Government Code to her own identifying information in the documents to be released. See Gov't Code § 552.023; Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the decision in *Ellen* from this requestor.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code 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 of the Government Code, which was 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 has 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. See *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 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 348. Upon review, we find the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. As no other exceptions against disclosure are raised, the submitted information must be released.¹

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,



Ana Carolina Vieira
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

ACV/ag

¹Because the requestor has a special right of access under section 552.023 of the Government Code to portions of the information being released, the city must again seek a ruling from this office if it receives another request for this particular information from a different requestor.

Ref: ID# 471761

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)