



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 7, 2016

Mr. Alan T. Ozuna
Counsel for City of Pharr
Denton, Navarro, Rocha, Bernal, Hyde & Zech, P.C.
701 E. Harrison, Suite 100
Harlingen, Texas 78550-9165

OR2016-24836

Dear Mr. Ozuna:

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# 633684.

The City of Pharr (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information pertaining to an investigation of the requestor and the requestor's personnel file. You state the city does not have any requested audio recordings.¹ You state the city has released some information. 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 of the Government Code 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 or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial*

¹The Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when a request for information was received or to prepare new information in response to a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

Foundation. Id. at 683. This office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No.455 (1987).

Additionally, 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. *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 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). We note the public generally has a legitimate interest in information that relates to public employment and public employees. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 542 (1990), 470 at 4 (1987) (public has legitimate interest in job qualifications and performance of public employees), 444 at 5-6 (1986) (public has legitimate interest in knowing reasons for dismissal, demotion, promotion, or resignation or public employees), 432 at 2 (1984) (scope of public employee privacy is narrow).

Upon review, we find the submitted information does not pertain to an investigation of alleged sexual harassment. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the *Ellen* decision. However, we find a portion of the information, which we marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the remaining information is not highly intimate or embarrassing or is of legitimate public interest. Thus, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

We note the remaining information contains information subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.² 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.

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).

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 individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1). The city may not withhold this information under section 552.117 if the employee did not make a timely election to keep the information confidential.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code if the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality pursuant to section 552.024 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,



Ramsey A. Abarca
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RAA/bw

Ref: ID# 633684

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)