



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 16, 2022

Ms. Tiffany Bangs
Assistant County Attorney
Harris County
1019 Congress, 15th Floor
Houston, Texas 77002

OR2022-04775

Dear Ms. Bangs:

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# 930598 (Ref. No. 21PIA0933).

The Harris County Constable's Office, Precinct 2 (the "constable's office") received a request for disciplinary records and personnel files of named individuals. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the submitted information includes officers' Texas Commission on Law Enforcement ("TCOLE") identification numbers. Section 552.002(a) of the Government Code defines "public information" as the following:

[I]nformation that is written, produced, collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business:

- (1) by a governmental body;
- (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body:
 - (A) owns the information;
 - (B) has a right of access to the information; or

(C) spends or contributes public money for the purpose of writing, producing, collecting, assembling, or maintaining the information; or

(3) by an individual officer or employee of a governmental body in the officer's or employee's official capacity and the information pertains to official business of the governmental body.

Gov't Code § 552.002(a). In Open Records Decision No. 581 (1990), this office determined certain computer information, such as source codes, documentation information, and other computer programming, that has no significance other than its use as a tool for the maintenance, manipulation, or protection of public property is not the kind of information made public under section 552.021 of the Government Code. We understand the officers' TCOLE identification numbers are unique computer-generated numbers assigned to peace officers for identification in TCOLE's electronic database, and may be used as an access device number on the TCOLE website. Thus, we find the officers' TCOLE numbers do not constitute public information under section 552.002 of the Government Code. Therefore, the officers' TCOLE numbers are not subject to the Act and need not be released to the requestor.

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

(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 includes completed reports and investigations that are subject to section 552.022(a)(1). The constable's office must release this information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(1) unless it is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code or is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* Although you seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103, section 552.103 is discretionary in nature and does 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. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the constable's office may not withhold the information subject to section 552.022, which we marked and indicated, under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, because sections 552.101, 552.102, 552.117, 552.130, and 552.137 of the Government Code make information confidential under the Act, we will consider the

applicability of these exceptions to the information at issue.¹ Additionally, we will consider your argument under section 552.103 against release of the information not subject to section 552.022.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

You state, and provide documentation showing, the remaining information at issue relates to two lawsuits that were pending against the constable's office and Harris County on the date the constable's office received the instant request for information. Based on your representations, the submitted documentation, and our review of the submitted information, we find litigation was pending when the constable's office received this request for information, and the information at issue is related to the pending litigation for the purposes of section 552.103. Therefore, the constable's office may withhold the information not subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. See Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, information

¹ 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).

that has either been obtained from or provided to all parties to the pending litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has been concluded. See Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); see also Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Accordingly, the constable’s office must withhold the public employees’ dates of birth under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

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. The court of appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. See Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (designation of beneficiary of employee’s retirement benefits, direct deposit authorization, and forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, participation in voluntary investment program, election of optional insurance coverage, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history). 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 *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*, 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). 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. 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 statements appear in a non-supervisory context.

In this instance, we find some of the information subject to section 552.022 pertains to a sexual harassment investigation and, thus, is subject to the ruling in *Ellen*. Upon review, we find the information at issue includes an adequate summary of this investigation, as well as a statement by the person accused of sexual harassment. 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 summary and the statement of the accused at issue, which we marked for release, the constable’s office must withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. However, in releasing the information within the summary and statement, the constable’s office must withhold the identities of victims and witnesses under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. Further, we find some of the remaining information, which we marked and indicated, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Thus, the constable’s office must withhold also this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

After reviewing the remaining information, we have determined no novel or complex issue exists in it. Thus, we address the remaining applicable exceptions in a summary ruling.

If the individuals at issue are currently licensed peace officers as defined by article 2.12, the constable’s office must withhold the information we marked and indicated under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. To the extent the employees at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the constable’s office must withhold the information we marked and indicated, under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The constable’s office must withhold motor vehicle information, including license plate number, driver’s license numbers, states of issuance, and vehicle identification numbers, under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The constable’s office must withhold personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release or

subsection (c) applies. The remaining information at issue must be released pursuant to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

Michelle Garza
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MRG/jxd

Ref: ID# 930598

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)