



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL
GREG ABBOTT

July 22, 2003

Mr. Jeffry R. Hill
Assistant General Counsel
Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation
P. O. Box 12157
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2003-5041

Dear Mr. Hill:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 184603.

The Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation (the "department") received two requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to an individual and a specified business entity. You state that you have provided the requestor with some responsive information. You claim, however, that the remaining requested information may be excepted from disclosure pursuant to sections 552.101 and 552.110 of the Government Code. Pursuant to section 552.305(d) of the Government Code, the department notified an interested third party, Roy Gordon Nisbett ("Nisbett"), of the department's receipt of the requests and of Nisbett's right to submit arguments to this office as to why information relating to him and the specified business entity should not be released to the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under Public Information Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the exceptions you claim and have reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that an interested third party is allowed ten 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 requested information relating to that party should be withheld from

disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Nisbett has not submitted comments to this office explaining why any portion of the remaining requested information should not be released to the requestor. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that the release of any portion of the remaining requested information would implicate Nisbett's proprietary interests. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm). Accordingly, we conclude that the department may not withhold any portion of the remaining requested information on the basis of any third party proprietary interest.

You claim that the remaining requested information may be excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common-law right to privacy.¹ We note that information must be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy when the information is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities and (2) of no legitimate public interest. *See Industrial Found. v. Texas Ind. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). Prior decisions of this office have determined that financial information relating only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first element of the common-law privacy test, but that the public has a legitimate interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 545 at 4 (1990) ("In general, we have found the kinds of financial information not excepted from public disclosure by common-law privacy to be those regarding the receipt of governmental funds or debts owed to governmental entities"), 523 at 4 (1989) (noting distinction under common-law privacy between confidential background financial information furnished to public body about individual and basic facts regarding particular financial transaction between individual and public body), 373 at 4 (1983) (determination of whether public's interest in obtaining personal financial information is sufficient to justify its disclosure must be made on case-by-case basis).

In this instance, you state that the remaining requested information constitutes financial information relating to a business transaction of an individual. However, you do not inform us, and we are unable to ascertain from our review of this information, whether the party regulated by the department in this matter is an individual or a business entity. If the party is an individual or a sole proprietorship, then the remaining requested information must be withheld pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the

¹ Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses information that is protected from disclosure by the common-law right to privacy.

common-law right to privacy. Otherwise, this information is not private under the doctrine of common-law privacy and must be released to the requestor.²

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 Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

²We note that common-law privacy protects the rights of individuals, not those of business entities. See Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right of privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business or other pecuniary interests); see also *United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950) (cited in *Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co., Inc.*, 777 S.W.2d 434, 436 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989), *rev'd on other grounds*, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990)) (corporation has no right to privacy).

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. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. 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,



Ronald J. Bounds
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RJB/lmt

Ref: ID# 184603

Enc. Submitted document

c: Mr. Jason A. Buchman
Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld, L.L.P.
1900 Pennzoil Place - South Tower
711 Louisiana Street
Houston, Texas 77002
(w/o enclosure)

Mr. Roy Gordon Nisbett
14520 Memorial Dr., Ste. M123
Houston, Texas 77079
(w/o enclosure)