



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 29, 2017

Mr. Eric K. Miller
Assistant General Counsel
Office of the General Counsel
Texas Department of Criminal Justice
P.O. Box 4004
Huntsville, Texas 77342-4004

OR2017-06437

Dear Mr. Miller:

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# 651190.

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to a specified investigation summary involving a named individual during a specified time period. You claim some of 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 from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy 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 in an employment context. 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 that the public's interest was sufficiently served by the disclosure of such documents. *Id.* In concluding, 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.*

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, 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). If no adequate summary of the investigation exists, then all of the information relating to the investigation ordinarily must be released, with the exception of information that would identify the victims and witnesses. We note that since 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, the identity of the individual accused of sexual harassment is not protected from public disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 438 (1986), 405 (1983), 230 (1979), 219 (1978). We note supervisors are generally not witnesses for purposes of *Ellen*, except where their statements appear in a non-supervisory context.

In this instance, the submitted information pertains to an investigation of alleged sexual harassment and thus, is subject to the ruling in *Ellen*. Upon review, we find the submitted information consists of an adequate summary of the alleged sexual harassment, and includes statements by the person accused of sexual harassment. Thus, the summary and statements of the accused are not confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. However, information within the summary and statements of the accused that identifies the victim must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. Therefore, the department must withhold the identifying information of the victim you have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. Further, because there is an adequate summary, the department must withhold the statements of the victim and witness you have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. 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,



Kieran Hillis
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KH/sb

Ref: ID# 651190

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)