



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 15, 2016

Ms. Laura Stone
Springtown Police Department
P.O. Box 444
Springtown, Texas 76082

OR2016-05926

Dear Ms. Stone:

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# 601610.

The Springtown Police Department (the "department") received a request for personnel and discipline information pertaining to a named officer. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the department's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). You state the department received the request for information on December 16, 2015. We note December 24 and 25, 2015 and January 1, 2016 were holidays. You do not inform us the department was closed for any other business days between December 16, 2015, and December 31, 2015. Accordingly, you were required to provide the information required by section 552.301(b) by January 4, 2016. However, the envelope in which the department provided the information required by section 552.301(b) was postmarked January 5, 2016. *See id.* § 552.308(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Accordingly, we conclude the department failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301 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 there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a governmental body may demonstrate a compelling reason to withhold information by showing that the information is made confidential by another source of law or affects third party interests. *See* ORD 630. You claim an exception to disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code, which is a discretionary exception that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 177 at 3 (1977) (statutory predecessor to section 552.108 subject to waiver). Accordingly, the department's claim under section 552.108 is not a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness and no portion of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.108 of the Government Code. However, we note portions of the submitted information are confidential under sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, and 552.130 of the Government Code. Sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, and 552.130 can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness.¹ Therefore, we will address the applicability of these sections to the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses section 1703.306 of the Occupations Code, which provides the following:

(a) A polygraph examiner, trainee, or employee of a polygraph examiner, or a person for whom a polygraph examination is conducted or an employee of the person, may not disclose information acquired from a polygraph examination to another person other than:

- (1) the examinee or any other person specifically designated in writing by the examinee;
- (2) the person that requested the examination;
- (3) a member, or the member's agent, of a governmental agency that licenses a polygraph examiner or supervises or controls a polygraph examiner's activities;

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

(4) another polygraph examiner in private consultation: or

(5) any other person required by due process of law.

(b) The [Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation] or any other governmental agency that acquires information from a polygraph examination under this section shall maintain the confidentiality of the information.

(c) A polygraph examiner to whom information acquired from a polygraph examination is disclosed under Subsection (a)(4) may not disclose the information except as provided by this section.

Occ. Code § 1703.306. Upon review, we find some of the submitted information, which we have marked, consists of information acquired from a polygraph examination subject to section 1703.306. The requestor does not appear to fall into any of the categories of individuals who are authorized to receive the polygraph information under section 1703.306(a). Therefore, the department must withhold the polygraph information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306(a) of the Occupations Code.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code 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). The Texas Supreme Court held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Upon review, we find the department must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which 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 highly intimate or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. In considering whether a public citizen’s date of birth is private, the Third Court of Appeals looked to the supreme court’s rationale in *Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts v. Attorney General of Texas*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). The supreme court concluded public employees’ dates of birth are private under section 552.102 of the Government Code because the employees’ privacy interest substantially outweighed the negligible public interest in

disclosure. *Texas Comptroller*, 354 S.W.3d at 347-48. Based on *Texas Comptroller*, the court of appeals concluded the privacy rights of public employees apply equally to public citizens, and thus, public citizens' dates of birth are also protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *City of Dallas*, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3.

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 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*, along with the statement of the accused. However, 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, when no adequate summary exists, detailed statements regarding the allegations must be released, but the identities of victims and witnesses 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 also note supervisors are generally not witnesses for purposes of *Ellen*, except where their statements appear in a non-supervisory context.

A portion of the remaining information pertains to a claim of workplace sexual harassment. Upon review, we find the information at issue includes an adequate summary of the investigation into the alleged sexual harassment and a statement of the accused. Thus, pursuant to the ruling in *Ellen*, this information is not confidential under common-law privacy. However, the information within the summary and statement identifying the alleged victim, which we have marked, is confidential under common-law privacy and must be withheld pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code. *See Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. The department must also withhold the remaining information in this sexual harassment investigation file, which we have marked, under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the court's holding in *Ellen*. *See id.* Further, the department must also withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code applies to records a governmental body holds in an employment capacity and excepts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, and social security number of a peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the

Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See id.* § 552.130(a). Accordingly, the department must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the department must withhold the polygraph information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 1703.306(a) of the Occupations Code. The department must withhold the date of birth we have marked under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code. The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and *Ellen* and all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code and under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The department 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,



Paige Lay
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

PL/som

Ref: ID# 601610

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)