



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 27, 2017

Ms. Lola Dada-Olley
Assistant City Attorney
City of Plano
P.O. Box 860358
Plano, Texas 75086-0358

OR2017-04255

Dear Ms. Dada-Olley:

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# ID# 647348 (Plano File No. 16-048).

The City of Plano (the "city") received a request for e-mails referencing the requestor sent by or to a named individual during a specified time period. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.111 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the city seeks to withdraw its request for an open records decision because it asserts the request for information was withdrawn by operation of law when the requestor failed to timely respond to a cost estimate for providing the requested records. Section 552.2615(a) of the Government Code provides if a request for a copy of public information or a request to inspect a paper record will result in the imposition of a charge that exceeds \$40, the governmental body shall provide the requestor with an itemized statement that details all estimated charges. Gov't Code § 552.2615(a). Section 552.2615(b) states if the requestor does not respond in writing to an itemized statement as described in section 552.2615(a) within 10 business days after the date the statement is sent to the requestor, the request is considered to have been withdrawn. *Id.* § 552.2615(b). The cost estimate you provided to the requestor and submitted to this office reveals the total cost for production of documents is \$35.50. Therefore, we find the cost estimate at issue was not one

sent pursuant to section 552.2615(a). Accordingly, we conclude the request for information was not withdrawn by operation of law. *See id.* Therefore, we will address your arguments against disclosure of 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.” *Id.* § 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. Further, this office has determined common-law privacy generally protects the identities of juvenile offenders. *See* Open Records Decision No. 394 (1983); *cf.* Fam. Code § 58.007(c). 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. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d 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.¹ *Tex. 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

¹Section 552.102(a) 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).

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, the identity of the individual accused of sexual harassment is not protected from public disclosure. Further, 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).

Some of the submitted information relates to an investigation into alleged sexual harassment. Upon review, we determine the information at issue does not contain an adequate summary of the alleged sexual harassment. Because there is no adequate summary of the investigation, the city must generally release the information at issue. However, the information at issue contains the identity of the alleged sexual harassment victim and witnesses. We note the requestor is the alleged sexual harassment victim. Section 552.023 of the Government Code states an individual has a special right of access to private information concerning herself. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a), (b) (individual has special right of access to information that relates to himself and is protected by laws intended to protect his privacy interests, and governmental body may not deny access on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning himself). Thus, the requestor has a right of access to information pertaining to herself that would otherwise be private. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked, which includes the identifying information of the witnesses, and all identifiable public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and *Ellen*.² *See Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. However, we find the remaining information is not highly intimate or embarrassing information or is of legitimate public interest. Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.111 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure “[a]n interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency[.]” Gov't Code § 552.111. This exception encompasses the deliberative process privilege. *See* Open Records Decision No. 615 at 2 (1993). The purpose of section 552.111 is to protect advice, opinion, and recommendation in the decisional process and to encourage open and frank discussion in the deliberative process. *See Austin v. City of San Antonio*, 630 S.W.2d 391, 394 (Tex. App.—San Antonio 1982, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 538 at 1-2 (1990).

In Open Records Decision No. 615, this office re-examined the statutory predecessor to section 552.111 in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*,

²As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ). We determined section 552.111 excepts from disclosure only those internal communications that consist of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *See* ORD 615 at 5. A governmental body's policymaking functions do not encompass routine internal administrative or personnel matters, and disclosure of information about such matters will not inhibit free discussion of policy issues among agency personnel. *Id.*; *see also City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351 (Tex. 2000) (section 552.111 not applicable to personnel-related communications that did not involve policymaking). A governmental body's policymaking functions do include administrative and personnel matters of broad scope that affect the governmental body's policy mission. *See* Open Records Decision No. 631 at 3 (1995).

Further, section 552.111 does not protect facts and written observations of facts and events severable from advice, opinions, and recommendations. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Tex. Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.); *see* ORD 615 at 5. But if factual information is so inextricably intertwined with material involving advice, opinion, or recommendation as to make severance of the factual data impractical, the factual information also may be withheld under section 552.111. *See* Open Records Decision No. 313 at 3 (1982).

You assert some of the remaining information reflects advice, recommendations, or opinions regarding policy issues. However, upon review, we find the information at issue pertains to routine internal administrative and personnel matters, and you have not demonstrated this information pertains to administrative or personnel matters of broad scope that affect the city's policy mission. Therefore, you have failed to demonstrate the deliberative process privilege applies to the information at issue. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.111 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.³ *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(a). Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked and all identifiable public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and *Ellen*. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record


³The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Kenny Moreland', written over a horizontal line.

Kenny Moreland
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KJM/sdk

Ref: ID# 647348

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)