



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 26, 2014

Ms. Jennifer DeCurtis
Counsel for City of Lavon
Messer, Rockefeller, & Fort, PLLC
6351 Preston Road, Suite 350
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2014-03504

Dear Ms. DeCurtis:

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# 515041.

The City of Lavon (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for a specified complaint. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.102 and 552.107 of the Government Code.¹ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the city's procedural obligations under the Act. Section 552.301 of the Government Code describes the procedural obligations placed on a governmental body that receives a written request for information it wishes to withhold. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), the governmental body must ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days after receiving the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a), (b). In this instance, you state, and submit documentation demonstrating, the city received the request for information on November 21, 2013. We note the city was closed on November 28 and 29, 2013 and December 6, 2013. This office does not count the date the request was received or holidays for the purpose of calculating a governmental

¹Although you raise section 552.022 of the Government Code, that provision is not an exception to disclosure. Rather, section 552.022 enumerates categories of information that are not excepted from disclosure unless they are expressly confidential under the Act or other law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022.

body's deadlines under the Act. Accordingly, the city's ten-business-day deadline was December 10, 2013. However, you did not request a ruling from this office until December 11, 2013. *See id.* § 552.308 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail). Consequently, we find the city failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 in requesting this decision from our office.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption the requested information is public and must be released unless a compelling reason exists 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); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a compelling reason to withhold information exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Although you raise section 552.107 of the Government Code for the submitted information, this section is discretionary in nature. It serves only to protect a governmental body's interests, and may be waived; as such, it does not constitute a compelling reason to withhold information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 676 at 12 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107 constitutes compelling reason to withhold information under section 552.302 only if information's release would harm third party); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Thus, the city has waived its claim under section 552.107 for the submitted information. However, because sections 552.101 and 552.102 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to withhold information, we will consider the applicability of these exceptions to the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "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 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. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. We note the submitted information relates to an investigation of alleged sexual harassment. 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* 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 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.

Upon review, we find this information does not contain an adequate summary of the investigation of 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 identifying information of the sexual harassment victim and witnesses. Accordingly, we find the city must withhold the identifying information of the employee who filed the sexual harassment complaint and the witnesses, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and *Ellen*. *See* 840 S.W.2d at 525. However, we find none of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

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). The Texas Supreme Court 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. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

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 *Ellen*. The city must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.102 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Megan G. Holloway". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped initial "M".

Megan G. Holloway
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MGH/akg

Ref: ID# 515041

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)