



May 31, 2001

Ms. Julie Reagan Watson
Assistant General Counsel
Texas Department of Human Services
P.O. Box 149030
Austin, Texas 78714-9030

OR2001-2246

Dear Ms. Watson:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act, chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 147788.

The Texas Department of Human Services (the "department") received a request for information relating to an investigation of an employee. You claim that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.117 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you raise and have reviewed the information you submitted.

We first note that the requested information falls within the scope of section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides in relevant part that

the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

- (1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1) (emphasis added). You state that the department has completed the investigation to which the requested information pertains. You do not raise section 552.108. Therefore, the department must release the requested information under section 552.022(a)(1), unless the information is expressly confidential under other law.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This exception encompasses the common law right to privacy. Information must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with common law privacy when (1) the information is highly intimate and embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, and (2) it is of no legitimate public interest. See *Industrial Found. v. Texas Ind. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), cert. denied, 430 U.S. 931 (1977).

In *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App. – El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court applied the common law right to privacy addressed in *Industrial Foundation* to an investigation of allegations of sexual harassment. The investigation files at issue in *Ellen* contained third-party witness statements, an affidavit in which the individual accused of the misconduct responded to the allegations, and the conclusions of the board of inquiry that conducted the investigation. See 840 S.W.2d at 525. The court upheld the release of the affidavit of the person under investigation and the conclusions of the board of inquiry, stating that the disclosure of such documents sufficiently served the public's interest in the matter. *Id.* The court further held, however, that "the public does 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 summary must be released under *Ellen*, but the identities of the victims and witnesses must be redacted, and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. See also Open Records Decision Nos. 393 (1983), 339 (1982). If no adequate summary of the investigation exists, all of the information relating to the investigation ordinarily must be released, with the exception of information that would tend to identify the victims and witnesses. In either case, the identity of the individual accused of sexual harassment is not protected from disclosure. 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. See Open Records Decision Nos. 438 (1986), 405 (1983), 230 (1979), 219 (1978).

In this instance, you inform this office that the department already has provided some of the responsive records to the requestor. You contend that the rest of the documents relating to the department's investigation are confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with common law privacy under *Morales v. Ellen*. Notations on the submitted documents reflect that you have released a five-page "Investigators Memorandum," a four-page "Report of Investigation," a four-page "Predetermination Interview" of the individual accused of the

alleged sexual harassment, and three other untitled documents. We have reviewed these documents and find that they constitute an adequate summary of the investigation. We therefore conclude that the department must withhold the remaining records under section 552.101 of the Government Code. As we are able to make this determination, we need not address your arguments under section 552.117.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the General Services Commission at 512/475-2497.

