



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

February 2, 2007

Ms. Christy Drake-Adams  
Bovey, Akers, Bojorquez, L.L.P.  
12325 Hymeadow Drive, Suite 2-100  
Austin, Texas 78750

OR2007-01354

Dear Ms. Drake-Adams:

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# 270533.

The City of Rollingwood (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information regarding the requestor. You state the city will release some information but you claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the city's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. The city received the request for information on October 16, 2006. The submitted documents indicate the city requested clarification of the request for information on October 23, 2006. Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); Open Records Decision No. 663 (1999) (deadlines tolled while governmental body awaits clarification). You inform us that the requestor replied to the clarification request on November 13, 2006, and further clarified the request with the city by phone on November 15 and 20, 2006. However, the envelope in which the city submitted the information required by section 552.301 to this office bears a postmark date of November 22, 2006. *See id.* § 552.308 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail); *see also* ORD 663. Accordingly, we conclude the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). A compelling reason exists when third-party interests are at stake or when information is confidential under other law. Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). Although you raise sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code, these exceptions are discretionary in nature. They serve only to protect a governmental body's interests and may be waived; as such, they do not constitute compelling reasons to withhold information for purposes of section 552.302. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 at 10 (2002) (attorney work-product privilege under section 552.111 or rule 192.5 is not compelling reason to withhold information under section 552.302 if it does not implicate third party rights), 676 at 12 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under section 552.107 or Texas Rule of Evidence 503 constitutes compelling reason to withhold information under section 552.302 only if information's release would harm third party), 663 at 5 (1999) (governmental body may waive sections 552.107 and 552.111), 470 (1987) (statutory predecessor to section 552.111 is discretionary exception); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions in general). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted information pursuant to sections 552.107 or 552.111. However, your claim under section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to withhold information and we will consider whether the submitted information is excepted under this exception.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the common-law right of privacy, which 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.*

Thus, if there is an adequate summary of an investigation of alleged sexual harassment, the investigation summary must be released along with the statement of the accused 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). If no adequate summary of the investigation exists, then all of the information relating to the investigation ordinarily must be released, with the exception of information that would identify the victims and witnesses. 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 the 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*. 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, the submitted information consists only of an adequate summary of a sexual harassment investigation. In accordance with the holding in *Ellen*, the city must release the summary, redacting information that identifies the alleged victim and witnesses. We have marked the identifying information that must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remainder of the submitted information must be released.<sup>1</sup>

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).

---

<sup>1</sup>Because the records being released contain information relating to the requestor that would be excepted from disclosure to the general public to protect her privacy, the city must request another ruling from our office if it receives a future request for this information from an individual other than this requestor or her authorized representative. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023 (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on grounds that information is considered confidential by privacy principles).

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,



Ramsey A. Abarca  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RAA/eb

Ref: ID# 270533

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Kimberly Blake  
3208 Canyon Ledge Cove  
Round Rock, Texas 78681  
(w/o enclosures)