



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 6, 2016

Mr. Guillermo Trevino
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
1000 Throckmorton Street, 3rd Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2016-07694

Dear Mr. Trevino:

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# 605260 (City PIR No. W048866).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for certain information pertaining to a specified investigation. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which 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, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation. Id.* at 683.

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 the public's interest was sufficiently served

by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* In concluding, the *Ellen* court held “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 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). However, 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).

The submitted information relates to an investigation into alleged sexual harassment. In this instance, although you seek to withhold the submitted information in its entirety, you have not demonstrated, nor does it otherwise appear, this is a situation in which the entirety of the information at issue must be withheld on the basis of common-law privacy. Further, we find none of the submitted information constitutes an adequate summary of the investigation. Therefore, the city must generally release the submitted information. However, this information contains the identifying information of the alleged sexual harassment victim, which we have marked. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and *Ellen*. *See* 840 S.W.2d at 525. As the city does not raise another exception to disclosure, the city must release the remaining information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, or call the Office of the Attorney General’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Lee Seidlits
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CLS/bw

Ref: ID# 605260

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)