



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 23, 2014

Ms. Alexis G. Allen
For the City of Red Oak
Nichols, Jackson, Dillard, Hager & Smith, L.L.P.
1800 Ross Tower
500 North Akard Street
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2014-10730

Dear Ms. Allen:

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# 527124 (File Ref. # 65654).

The City of Red Oak (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to investigations of grievances filed against 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 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. *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 "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, because 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 also note supervisors are generally not witnesses for purposes of *Ellen*, except where their statements appear in a non-supervisory context.

In this instance, the submitted information pertains to a sexual harassment investigation and, thus, is subject to the ruling in *Ellen*. Upon review, we find the submitted information includes an adequate summary of the investigation, as well as a statement by the person accused of sexual harassment. The summary and statement of the accused are not confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. Therefore, with the exception of the summary and the statement of the accused, the city must withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. We note, however, information within the summary and accused's statement that identifies the victim and a witness is confidential under common-law privacy. *See Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. The requestor is the alleged sexual harassment victim. Section 552.023 of the Government Code states a person has a special right of access to information that relates to the person and that is protected from disclosure by laws intended to protect the person's privacy interest. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (governmental body may not deny access to whom information relates or person's authorized representative on grounds that information is considered confidential by privacy principles). Thus, the requestor has a special right of access to her own information, and the city may not withhold this information in the summary or the accused's statement from the requestor under section 552.101 on the basis of common-law privacy. Accordingly, only the identifying information of the witness in the accused's statement, which we have marked, must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*.

We note portions of the remaining information in the accused's statement are subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.¹ Section 552.117(a)(1) applies to records a governmental body holds in an employment capacity and excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117 on behalf of a current or former official or employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Accordingly, if the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024, the information we have marked must be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1). The city may not withhold this information under section 552.117 for those employees who did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential.

In summary, with the exception of the summary and the statement of the accused, the city must withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. Within the statement of the accused, 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* and the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code, if the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information.²

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

¹The 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).

²Because the requestor has a right of access beyond that of the general public to some of the information being released, if the city receives another request for this information from an individual other than this requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023; ORD 481 at 4.

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 "Lindsay E. Hale". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping initial "L".

Lindsay E. Hale
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEH/akg

Ref: ID# 527124

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)