



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 18, 2007

Ms. Vanessa A. Gonzalez  
Allison, Bass & Associates, L.L.P.  
402 West 12<sup>th</sup> Street  
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2007-16696

Dear Ms. Gonzalez:

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 #297633.

Burleson County (the "county"), which you represent, received a request for a specified Equal Employment Opportunity Commission ("EEOC") complaint. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.102 and 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that some of the information you have submitted to us for review is not responsive to the request for information. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request, and the county is not required to release this information, which we have marked, in response to this request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed).

Next, we address the county'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. Section 552.301(e-1) provides the following:

A governmental body that submits written comments to the attorney general under Subsection (e)(1)(A) shall send a copy of those comments to the person

who requested the information from the governmental body. If the written comments disclose or contain the substance of the information requested, the copy of the comments provided to the person must be a redacted copy.

Gov't Code § 552.301(e-1). While the county sent to the requestor a copy of its written comments submitted to this office pursuant to section 552.301(e)(1)(A), the county redacted most of its discussion of the asserted exceptions from this copy. After review of the copy of the county's brief sent to the requestor, we conclude that the county redacted information from the copy that does not disclose or contain the substance of the information requested; therefore, we conclude that the county failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301(e-1) of the Government Code.

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 id.* § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). This office has held that a compelling reason exists to withhold information when third party interests are at stake or when information is made confidential by another source of law. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977) (construing predecessor statute). Section 552.103 of the Government Code is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Gov't Code § 552.007; *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 Gov't Code § 552.103); Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). In failing to comply with section 552.301, the department waived its claim under section 552.103. Therefore, the submitted information may not be withheld on the basis of the county's claim under this exception. However, the county's claim under section 552.102 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason for non-disclosure. Accordingly, we will address your argument under this exception.

You assert that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.102 of the Government Code. Section 552.102 excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy." Gov't Code § 552.102(a). This exception applies when the release of information would result in a violation of the common-law right to privacy. *Hubert v. Harte-Hanks Tex. Newspapers*, 652S.W.2d 546 (Tex. App.—Austin 1983, writ *ref'd n.r.e.*). The common-law right to privacy is violated if the information (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts about a person's private affairs such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) is of no legitimate concern to the public. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540

S.W.2d668, 683-85 (Tex. 1976). The type 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. In addition, this office has found that the identities of victims of sexual harassment are excepted from disclosure under common-law privacy. *See Morales v. Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d 519 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1992, writ denied) (identity of witnesses to and victims of sexual harassment was highly intimate or embarrassing information and public did not have a legitimate interest in such information). Upon review, the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.102 of the Government Code. The remaining responsive 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,



Reg Hargrove  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

RJH/eeg

Ref: ID# 297633

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Roy Sanders  
Managing Editor  
Burlison County Tribune  
c/o Vanessa a Gonzalez  
Allison Bass & Associates L.L.P.  
402 West 12th St  
Austin Texas 7870  
(w/o enclosures)