



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 13, 2017

Mr. Brian J. Knowles
Counsel for City of Hutto
Sheets & Crossfield, P.C.
309 East Main Street
Round Rock, Texas 78664-5246

OR2017-07932

Dear Mr. Knowles:

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# 653325.

The City of Hutto (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for a letter pertaining to a specified incident. 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 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 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 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. *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.


The submitted information relates to an investigation into an alleged sexual harassment. Upon review, we determine the submitted information 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 any information pertaining to the sexual harassment investigation. However, the information at issue contains the identity of the victim of the alleged sexual harassment. Accordingly, the city must withhold such information, which we have marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. See *Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. However, we find you have not demonstrated any portion of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Thus, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. Therefore, 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 "Kaelan A. Henze". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "K".

Kaelan A. Henze
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KAH/eb

Ref: ID# 653325

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)