



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 15, 2014

Ms. Lori J. Robinson
Staff Attorney
Austin Independent School District
1111 West Sixth Street
Austin, Texas 78703

OR2014-12171

Dear Ms. Robinson:

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# 529099.

The Austin Independent School District (the "district") received a request for complaints and disciplinary actions against three named district officers.¹ You state the district released some of the requested information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information is part of a completed investigation subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(1) provides for the required public disclosure of "a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body[.]" unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is expressly made confidential under the Act or other law. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). Although you raise section 552.103 of the Government Code, we note section 552.103 is a discretionary exception to disclosure and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). As such, the district may not withhold the

¹We note the requestor clarified her request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

submitted information under section 552.103. However, because section 552.101 makes information confidential under the Act, we will address its applicability to the submitted information.²

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.

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.

The submitted information relates to an investigation into alleged sexual harassment. Upon review, we determine this information contains an adequate summary of the alleged sexual harassment. The adequate summary is not confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy; however, information within the adequate summary identifying victims and witnesses must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in

²The 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).

conjunction with common-law privacy. *See Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. Therefore, pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*, the district must withhold the identifying information of the victim and witnesses, which we have marked, within the adequate summary. The remainder of the information within the adequate summary is not confidential under common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*, and must be released. Additionally, the district must withhold the remaining submitted information, which we have marked, in this sexual harassment investigation under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*.

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,



Megan G. Holloway
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MGH/eb

Ref: ID# 529099

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Mariana G. Evans
Rogers, Morris & Grover, LLP
5718 Westheimer Road, Suite 1200
Houston, Texas 77057
(w/o enclosures)