



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 9, 2019

Ms. Jennifer Burnett
University of Texas System
Office of General Counsel
210 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2901

OR2019-18476

Dear Ms. Burnett:

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# 774122 (OGC No. 189988)

The University of Texas at Tyler (the "university") received a request for information regarding alleged sexual assault or sexual misconduct during a specified time period, including communications regarding Title IX.¹ You state the university will release some information. We understand you have redacted student-identifying information from the submitted documents pursuant to the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act ("FERPA"), section 1232g of title 20 of the United States Code.² You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.117 of

¹You state the university sought and received clarification of the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

²The United States Department of Education Family Policy Compliance Office (the "DOE") has informed this office FERPA does not permit state and local educational authorities to disclose to this office, without parental or student consent, unredacted, personally identifiable information contained in education records for the purpose of our review in the open records ruling process under the Act. The DOE has determined FERPA determinations must be made by the educational authority in possession of the education records. A copy of this letter may be found on the Office of the Attorney General's website: <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/sites/default/files/files/divisions/open-government/20060725-USDOE-FERPA.pdf>.

the Government Code.³ We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.⁴

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. The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. Additionally, this office has concluded some kinds of medical information are generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987).

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 the *Ellen* decision 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

³ Although you do not raise section 552.117 in your brief, we understand you to raise this section based on your markings in the submitted information.

⁴ We assume the “representative sample” of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

generally not witnesses for purposes of *Ellen*, except where their statements appear in a non-supervisory context.

Upon review, we find some of the submitted information relates to a sexual harassment investigation which does not include an adequate summary. Thus, the university must generally release the information pertaining to the investigation. We note, however, this information contains the identities of the alleged sexual harassment victim and witnesses. Additionally, we find the information you marked satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the university must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See* 840 S.W.2d at 525.

Section 552.117(a)(1) excepts from disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). Whether information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). The university may only withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of current or former officials or employees who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Therefore, if the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024, the university must withhold the information you marked, and the additional information we marked, under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, if the individual at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the university may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

In summary, the university must withhold the information you marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The university must withhold the information you marked and we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code if the individual at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code. The university 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 that reads "Britni Ramirez". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Britni Ramirez
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BR/jxd

Ref: ID# 774122

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)