



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

December 15, 2017

Ms. Lara Jean D. Lenzsch
Counsel for the City of Sealy
Lenzsch Law Firm
P.O. Box 334
Barker, Texas 77413

OR2017-28550

Dear Ms. Lenzsch:

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# 688148.

The City of Sealy (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for a specified internal affairs investigation. 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 demonstrated. *See 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 that 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*, 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). We note, because 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 also note supervisors are generally not witnesses for purposes of *Ellen*, except where their information appears in a non-supervisory context.

In this instance, we agree the submitted information pertains to a sexual harassment investigation and, thus, is subject to the ruling in *Ellen*. Upon review, however, we find 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 and statement of the victim of, and the identities of the witnesses to, the alleged sexual harassment. Accordingly, the city must withhold such information, which we marked, under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. *See Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. However, we find none of the remaining information identifies a victim or witness to the investigation. Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code exempts 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.¹ *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. We note some of the remaining information, which we have marked,

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).

may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code. In this instance, however, it is unclear whether the individual whose information is at issue is currently a licensed peace officer as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Accordingly, to the extent the individual whose information is at issue is currently a licensed peace officer as defined by article 2.12, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the individual whose information is at issue is no longer a licensed peace officer as defined by article 2.12, then the city may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(2).

If the marked information at issue pertains to an individual who is no longer a licensed peace officer, then the marked information may be subject to section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the home address and telephone number, emergency contact information, social security number, and family member information of a current or former employee of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.117(a)(1). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989)*. Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Therefore, to the extent the individual whose information is at issue is no longer a peace officer as defined by article 2.12 and to the extent the individual timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, to the extent the individual at issue is no longer a peace officer as defined by article 2.12 and did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1).

In summary, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the individual whose information is at issue is currently a licensed peace officer, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. To the extent the individual whose information is at issue is no longer a peace officer and to the extent the individual timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1) 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 "Ramsey A. Abarca", with a long, sweeping horizontal line extending to the right.

Ramsey A. Abarca
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RAA/gw

Ref: ID# 688148

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)