



Office of the Attorney General
State of Texas

DAN MORALES
ATTORNEY GENERAL

July 7, 1998

Ms. Kate Herrington
Open Records Coordinator
Texas Department of Mental Health
and Mental Retardation
P.O. Box 12668
Austin, Texas 78711-2668

OR98-1595

Dear Ms. Herrington:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Texas Open Records Act (the "act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 116449.

The Texas Department of Mental Health and Mental Retardation (the "department") received a request for a copy of a specific final determination of the Psychiatric Residency Training Committee. Although you raise no exception to disclosure on behalf of the department, you state that the requested information may be confidential by a right of privacy.¹ We have reviewed the documents at issue and considered the submitted, third-party arguments. See Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Open Records Act in certain circumstances).

Section 552.102 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). In *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Texas Newspapers*, 652 S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ ref'd n.r.e.), the court ruled that the test to be applied to information claimed to be protected under section 552.102 is the same as the

¹In its initial brief to this office, the department sought to withhold the requested document under section 552.103. The department has subsequently withdrawn its 552.103 claim.

test formulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* for information claimed to be protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy as incorporated by section 552.101 of the act. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses information protected by constitutional or common-law privacy and excepts from disclosure private facts about an individual. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). Therefore, information may be withheld from the public when (1) it is highly intimate and embarrassing such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, and (2) there is no legitimate public interest in its disclosure. *Id.* at 685; Open Records Decision No. 611 (1992) at 1.

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 that "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.* In this instance, we believe that the public has a legitimate interest in the information relating to the accused. Therefore, the requested document is not protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy.


The constitutional right to privacy protects two interests. Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) at 4 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 1062 (1986)). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the "zones of privacy" recognized by the United States Supreme Court. Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992) at 4. The zones of privacy recognized by the United States Supreme Court are matters pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *See id.*

The second interest is the interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. The test for whether information may be publicly disclosed without violating constitutional privacy rights involves a balancing of the individual's privacy interests against the public's need to know information of public concern. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987) at 5-7 (citing *Fadjo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172, 1176 (5th Cir. 1981)). The scope of information considered private under the constitutional doctrine is far narrower than that under the common law; the material must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987) at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d 490, 492 (5th Cir. 1985), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 1062 (1986)). After careful review, we

do not believe that the document at issue is protected by a constitutional right of privacy. Therefore, the requested information must be released to the requestor.²

We are resolving this matter with an informal letter ruling rather than with a published open records decision. This ruling is limited to the particular records at issue under the facts presented to us in this request and should not be relied on as a previous determination regarding any other records. If you have any questions regarding this ruling, please contact our office.

Yours very truly,



June B. Harden
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JBH/ch

Ref.: ID# 116449

Enclosures: Submitted documents

cc: Ms. Karen Key Johnson
Attorney at Law
P.O. Box 9411
Austin, Texas 78766
(w/o enclosures)

²In this instance, the victim of the alleged sexual harassment is also the requestor. Thus, she is entitled to information relating to herself. Gov't Code § 552.023 (right of access to records that contain information relating to person that are protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person's privacy interests). However, if someone other than the victim of the investigation or her attorney requests the information, the department should reassert its arguments against disclosure at that time.