



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 13, 2017

Mr. Leonard V. Schneider  
Counsel for the City of Huntsville  
Liles Parker PLLC  
2261 Northpark Drive, Suite 445  
Kingwood, Texas 77339

OR2017-15661

Dear Mr. Schneider:

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# 667797.

The Huntsville Police Department (the "department"), which you represent, received a request for all notes, memoranda, and statements pertaining to a specified investigation. You state you will release some information to the requestor. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the requested information may have been the subject of a previous ruling from this office. In Open Records Letter No. 2017-10941 (2017), this office ruled the department must withhold some information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen* and in conjunction with the Medical Practice Act, but must release the remaining responsive information. We have no indication the law, facts, or circumstances upon which the prior ruling was based have changed. Accordingly, to the extent the requested information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon, the department must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2017-10941 as a previous determination, and withhold or release the previously

ruled upon information in accordance with it. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in a prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). However, to the extent the information in the current request is not encompassed by the prior ruling, we will consider the exceptions you raise.

Next, we note the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a) provides, in relevant part:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

(1) a completed report, audit, evaluation, or investigation made of, for, or by a governmental body, except as provided by Section 552.108[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(1). The submitted information consists of a completed investigation that is subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The department must release the completed investigation pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or are made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* The department seeks to withhold portions of the submitted information under sections 552.103 and 552.107 of the Government Code. However, sections 552.103 and 552.107 are discretionary in nature and do not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive Gov't Code § 552.103); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 10-11 (2002) (attorney-client privilege under Gov't Code § 552.107(1) may be waived), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.103 or section 552.107 of the Government Code. However, the Texas Supreme Court has held the Texas Rules of Evidence are “other law” within the meaning of section 552.022. *See In re City of Georgetown*, 53 S.W.3d 328, 336 (Tex. 2001). We will therefore consider your assertion of the attorney-client privilege under rule 503 of the Texas Rules of Evidence. Further, as sections 552.101 and 552.117 of the Government Code make information

confidential under the Act, we will consider the applicability of these sections to the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup>

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.

---

<sup>1</sup>The 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).

In this instance, the information subject to section 552.022(a)(1) pertains to an investigation of alleged sexual harassment and thus, is subject to the ruling in *Ellen*. Upon review, we find the information at issue includes an adequate summary, as well as a statement by the person accused of sexual harassment, which we marked. Thus, the summary and statement of the accused are not confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. Therefore, with the exception of the adequate summary and the statement of the accused, which we marked for release, the department must withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*.<sup>2</sup>

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home address, home telephone number, personal pager and cellular telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a peace officer, regardless of whether the peace officer complies with sections 552.024 or 552.1175 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2). Upon review, we find the department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the requested information is identical to the information previously requested and rule upon, the department must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2017-10941 as a previous determination and withhold or release the identical information in accordance with that ruling. With the exception of the adequate summary and the statement of the accused we marked for release, the department must withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. The department must withhold the information we marked in the statement of the accused under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. The department must release the remaining information.<sup>4</sup>

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.

---

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

<sup>3</sup>Section 552.117(a)(2) adopts the definition of peace officer found in article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

<sup>4</sup>We note the requestor has a right of access to some information being released pursuant to section 552.023 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves).

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](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 cursive script that reads "Ashley Crutchfield". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the typed name.

Ashley Crutchfield  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

AC/bw

Ref: ID# 667797

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)