



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL
GREG ABBOTT

April 22, 2003

Mr. James L. Hall
Assistant General Counsel
Office of the General Counsel
Texas Department of Criminal Justice
P.O. Box 4004
Huntsville, Texas 77342-4004

OR2003-2688

Dear Mr. Hall:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 179768.

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice (the "department") received a request for a particular sexual harassment investigation. 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 claim and have reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 protects "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information if (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683.

Furthermore, in *Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App. – El Paso 1992, writ denied), the court applied the doctrine of common-law privacy 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 id.* 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.* In accordance with *Ellen*, with respect to investigations of sexual harassment, this office typically has required the release of a document analogous to the conclusions of the board of inquiry in *Ellen*, but has held that a governmental body must withhold both the identities of victims and witnesses of alleged sexual harassment and any information that would tend to identify such a victim or witness. *See also* Open Records Decision Nos. 393 (1983), 339 (1982).

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).

Upon review of the submitted information, we agree that the document you have submitted at Tab A constitutes an adequate summary of the investigation into the relevant sexual harassment complaint. We conclude that the release of most of this summary serves the legitimate public interest in the harassment allegations. Based on *Ellen*, however, we agree that the department must withhold information identifying the alleged victim and witnesses, which we have marked, from the summary. Further, the identity of the individual accused of sexual harassment is not protected from public disclosure, as common-law privacy does not protect information about a public employee's alleged misconduct on the job or complaints made about the employee's job performance. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 438 (1986), 230 (1979), 219 (1978). Therefore, we also agree that the statements of the accused, submitted at Tab D, must also be released with the identifying information of the alleged victim and witnesses that we have marked redacted. Because the release of the redacted summary and accused's statements adequately serve the public interest in the information at issue, we further conclude that the remaining information is excepted from

disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy. As section 552.101 is dispositive, we do not address your claim 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 Dep't of Pub. 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 Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this

ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Kristen Bates", written over a printed name.

Kristen Bates
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAB/lmt

Ref: ID# 179768

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Clifton White
1745 Palo Alto
Mesquite, Texas 75150
(w/o enclosures)