



December 13, 2001

Mr. Brett Bray
Division Director
Motor Vehicle Division
Texas Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 2293
Austin, Texas 78768

OR2001-5816

Dear Mr. Bray:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 156110.

The Department of Transportation (the "department") received a request for a copy of the surety bond of one of the department's Motor Vehicle Board licensees. You state that the department does not want to withhold the requested information, but that a prior ruling from this office, Open Records Letter No. 2001-4160 (2001), declared surety bonds and riders to be confidential. Although you previously requested a decision as to whether such information should be withheld from disclosure, you now contend that such information is not confidential under common law privacy. We note that you have submitted correspondence indicating that you have notified the licensee of the current request pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code. *See Gov't Code § 552.305* (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Public Information Act in certain circumstances). We have considered your arguments 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." Section 552.101 encompasses the common law right to privacy. Information is protected under the common-law right to privacy when (1) the information contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) the information is not of legitimate concern to the public. *See Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), cert. denied, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). Prior decisions of this office have found that personal financial information

not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is protected by common law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990). We note, however, that common law privacy protects the rights of individuals, not corporations. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 192 (1978), 620 (1993) (corporation has no common law privacy interest in its financial information); *see also United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950). Based on our review of your arguments, we conclude that there is a legitimate public interest in its disclosure. Thus, the requested surety bond is not protected by common law privacy.

An interested third party is allowed 10 business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, the third party, M.P. Nazarko, has not submitted to this office reasons explaining why the submitted information should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding that the requested information must be withheld from disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (stating that if governmental body takes no position, attorney general will grant exception to disclosure under statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110(a) if third party makes *prima facie* case that information qualifies as trade secret under section 757 of Restatement of Torts, and no argument is presented that rebuts claim as a matter of law), 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under Gov't Code § 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm). Therefore, the department must release the requested information.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public

records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Gregory T. Simpson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

GTS/sdk

Ref: ID# 156110

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Willy Sullivan
General Manager
Toyota of Plano
1001 Preston Road
Plano, Texas 75093
(w/o enclosures)