



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 19, 2022

Ms. Karen Stack
Legal & Legislative Services Manager
City of Brenham
P.O. Box 1059
Brenham, Texas 77834-1059

OR2022-32100

Dear Ms. Stack:

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# 978760 (ORR Nos. 22-07-51 & 22-07-52).

The City of Brenham (the “city”) received two requests from different requestors for personnel records related to a named former city employee. The second requestor additionally seeks personnel records related to a second named former city employee. The city claims the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have considered the exception the city claims and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public 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.

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

The information submitted as Exhibit B relates to several investigations of alleged sexual harassment. Upon review, we find the information at issue contains adequate summaries of each investigation of alleged sexual harassment. The information also contains a statement of the accused. The summaries and statement of the accused, which we marked, are not confidential under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy; however, information within the summaries and statement that identifies victims and witnesses must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. *See Ellen*, 840 S.W.2d at 525. Therefore, the city must withhold the identifying information of the victims and witnesses within the summaries and the statement of the accused, which we marked, pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. Because there is an adequate summary, the city must also withhold the remaining information in the sexual harassment investigations, which we marked, under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the common-law informer's privilege, which Texas courts have long recognized. *See Aguilar v. State*, 444 S.W.2d 935, 937 (Tex. Crim. App. 1969). The informer's privilege protects from disclosure the identities of persons who report activities over which the governmental body has criminal or quasi-criminal law-enforcement authority. *See* Open Records Decision No. 208 at 1-2 (1978). The informer's privilege protects the identities of individuals who report violations of statutes to the police or similar law-enforcement agencies, as well as those who report violations of statutes with civil or criminal penalties to "administrative officials having a duty of inspection or of law enforcement within their particular spheres." Open Records Decision No. 279 at 1-2 (1981) (citing 8 John H. Wigmore, *Evidence in Trials at Common Law*, § 2374, at 767 (J. McNaughton Rev. Ed. 1961)). The report must be of a violation of a criminal or civil statute. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 582 at 2 (1990), 515 at 4 (1988). However, witnesses who provide information in the course of an investigation but do not make a report of the violation are not informants for the purposes of claiming the informer's privilege. The privilege excepts the informer's statement only

to the extent necessary to protect that informer's identity. Open Records Decision No. 549 at 5 (1990). We note the informer's privilege does not apply where the informant's identity is known to the individual who is the subject of the complaint. *See* ORD 208 at 1-2.

The city asserts portions of the information submitted as Exhibits C and D identify complainants who reported violations to the city. Upon review, however, we find the city has failed to demonstrate any of the information at issue identifies a complainant who reported a violation of a criminal or civil statute for purposes of the informer's privilege. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of Exhibit C or Exhibit D under section 552.101 on that basis.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses information protected by section 560.003 of the Government Code, which provides, "[a] biometric identifier in the possession of a governmental body is exempt from disclosure under [the Act]." Gov't Code § 560.003; *see id.* § 560.001(1) ("biometric identifier" means retina or iris scan, fingerprint, voiceprint, or record of hand or face geometry). There is no indication the requestor has a right of access to the submitted thumbprints under section 560.002. *See id.* § 560.002(1)(A) (governmental body may not sell, lease, or otherwise disclose individual's biometric identifier to another person unless the individual consents to disclosure). Accordingly, the city must withhold the thumbprints we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code.

Some of the remaining information at issue is protected under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy, which is subject to the two-part test discussed above. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. The Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens' dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See 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.). Upon review, we find some of the submitted information, which we marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure the home address, home telephone number, emergency contact information, and social security number of a current or honorably retired peace officer, as well as information that reveals whether the current or honorably retired peace officer has family members, regardless of whether the current or honorably retired peace officer complies with sections 552.024 and 552.1175 of the Government Code.¹ *See* Act of May 31, 2021, 87th Leg., R.S., S.B. 841, § 2 (to be codified at Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(2)); Act of May 31, 2021, 87th Leg., R.S.,

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).

S.B. 841, § 1 (to be codified at Gov't Code § 552.003(1-b)) (defining “honorably retired” for purposes of the Act). We note, for purposes of section 552.117, “family member” means a spouse, minor child, or adult child who resides in the person’s home. *See* Act of June 7, 2021, 87th Leg., R.S., S.B. 1134, § 9 (to be codified at Gov't Code § 552.117(c)) (providing “family member” has meaning assigned by Fin. Code § 31.006(d)). Section 552.117(a)(2) applies to current or honorably retired peace officers as defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked pertaining to current peace officers under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code 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 or official of a governmental body who requests this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). 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 or official 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 or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. We marked information related to a current city employee and information related to a former city police officer, and the city informs us the former police officer was dishonorably discharged and lost his commission under the Texas Commission on Law Enforcement. Therefore, to the extent the individuals whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone number may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. Conversely, to the extent the individuals at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator’s license, driver’s license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with

a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). *See* Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not excluded by subsection (c). Therefore, the city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we marked in Exhibit B pursuant to section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy and the holding in *Ellen*. The city must withhold the thumbprints we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we marked pertaining to current peace officers under section 552.117(a)(2) of the Government Code. To the extent the current city employee and the former police officer whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the marked cellular telephone number may be withheld only if a governmental body does not pay for the cellular telephone service. The city must withhold the motor vehicle record information we marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the personal e-mail addresses we marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure. The city must release the remaining information.²

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,

Claire V. Morris Sloan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CVMS/jxd

² The information being released contains social security numbers. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person’s social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.147(b).

Ref: ID# 978760

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)