



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 12, 2006

Mr. William M. Buechler  
Buechler & Associates, P.C.  
Attorney for Crowley Independent School District  
3660 Stoneridge Road, Suite D-101  
Austin, Texas 78746

OR2006-14537

Dear Mr. Buechler:

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# 267426.

The Crowley Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for the requestor's client's personnel file, a copy of a tape recording of a meeting between the requestor's client and the district, and all information prepared or obtained by the district in connection with an investigation of the requestor's client. You state that the district has released the requestor's client's personnel file and tape recording to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup>In subsequent correspondence with this office, the district withdrew its initial assertions of sections 552.103, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.114 of the Government Code as exceptions to disclosure. In addition, you indicate that you will redact portions of the information being released in accordance with the federal Family Education Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"). See Open Records Decision No. 634 (1995) (educational agency or institution may withhold from public disclosure information that is protected by FERPA and excepted from required public disclosure by sections 552.026 and 552.101 without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision as to those exceptions).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision,” and encompasses the doctrine of common law privacy. Gov’t Code § 552.101. 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. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976).

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.*

When there is an adequate summary of a sexual harassment investigation, the summary must be released along with the statement of the accused, but the identities of the victims and witnesses must be redacted and their detailed statements must be withheld from disclosure. However, when no adequate summary exists, detailed statements regarding the allegations must be released, but the identities of witnesses and victims 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 note that, because supervisors are not witnesses for purposes of *Ellen*, supervisors’ identities may not generally be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*.

In this instance, the submitted information relates to an ongoing sexual harassment investigation. Because there is no adequate summary of the investigation, the documents relating to the sexual harassment investigation must generally be released with the identities of the witnesses and victim redacted pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. We have marked this identifying information. The remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Lisa V. Cubriel  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LVC/eb

Ref: ID# 267426

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Karl Tiger Hanner  
Brim, Arnett, Robinett, Hanner, Conners & McCormick, P.C.  
2525 Wallingwood Drive, Building 14  
Austin, Texas 78746  
(w/o enclosures)