



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 9, 2007

Mr. Bob Schell
Assistant District Attorney
Dallas County
411 Elm Street, 5th Floor
Dallas, Texas 75202

OR2007-13141

Dear Mr. Schell:

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# 291342.

Dallas County (the "county") received a request for two specified reports. You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the submitted information consists of completed reports that are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code, which enumerates categories of information that are not excepted from required disclosure unless they "are expressly confidential under other law." This section provides in pertinent part:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, 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). Therefore, the county may only withhold the completed reports under section 552.022 if they are confidential under other law or excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. You argue that the submitted information is excepted under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, section 552.103 is a discretionary exception and, as such, is not other law for purposes of section 552.022. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (discretionary exceptions generally). Consequently, the county may not withhold the submitted reports under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.”¹ Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the common-law right of privacy, which protects information that is 1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and 2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). 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. This office has found that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are excepted from required public disclosure under common law privacy, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). 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. *Id.* 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 its conclusion, 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

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.101 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

statements. In either case, the identity of the individual accused of sexual harassment is not protected from public disclosure. We further note that 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, we find that the submitted information contains information from a sexual harassment investigation. However, it does not include an adequate summary. Consequently, we conclude that the county must withhold only the identifying information of the alleged victims and witnesses, which we have marked, pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*.

We note that some of the remaining submitted information may be subject to section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure "information that relates to the home address, home telephone number, or social security number" of a peace officer, or that reveals whether the peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the officer complies with section 552.024 or section 552.1175. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). Accordingly, we conclude that the county must withhold the information that we have marked if it pertains to an individual who is a licensed peace officer.²

If any portion of the information we have marked does not pertain to a licensed peace officer, then the information may still be excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who timely request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). However, information that is responsive to a request may not be withheld from disclosure under section 552.117(a)(1) if the employee did not request confidentiality for this information in accordance with section 552.024 or if the request for confidentiality under section 552.024 was not made until after the request for information was received by the governmental body. Whether a particular piece of information is public must be determined at the time the request for it is received by the governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Accordingly, we conclude that to the extent that any of the information we have marked relates to an individual who elected confidentiality for this information prior to the date that the county received this request, the county must withhold that information pursuant to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The

²Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. *See* Crim. Pro. Code art. 2.12.

county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2), to the extent that it pertains to an individual who is a licensed peace officer. The county must withhold the remaining information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1), to the extent that the employee whose information is at issue made a timely election under section 552.024. The remaining submitted 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Henisha D. Anderson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, stylized initial "H".

Henisha D. Anderson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

HDA/jb

Ref: ID# 291342

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Sandra E. Key
Bellinger & DeWolf, L.L.P.
10000 North Central Expressway, Suite 900
Dallas, Texas 75231
(w/o enclosures)