



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 30, 2007

Ms. Kelly E. Pagan  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
1000 Throckmorton Street  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2007-14226

Dear Ms. Pagan:

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# 293262.

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to a specified taxicab company and a named taxicab driver. You claim that some of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.122, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code. You also contend that the requested information may constitute proprietary information of a third party subject to exception under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.305(d) of the Government Code, you have notified Irving Holdings Inc. of the request and of its opportunity to submit comments to this office. *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 section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). We have considered the exceptions you claim and 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 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, Irving Holdings Inc. has not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why the submitted information should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information constitutes proprietary information pertaining to Irving Holdings Inc, and none

of it may be withheld on that basis. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if (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. *Indus. Found. v. Texas 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. *Id.* at 681-82. This office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990). We note that common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals, and not those of corporate entities and other business organizations. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); *see also* *U. S. v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950); *Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989), *rev'd* on other grounds, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990) (corporation has no right to privacy). Upon review, we have marked the information that must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. As to the information you have marked, however, we find that it is not protected by common-law privacy and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

You claim Exhibit C-2 is excepted from disclosure under section 552.122 of the Government Code. Section 552.122(b) excepts from disclosure test items developed by a licensing agency or governmental body. *See* Gov't Code § 552.122. In Open Records Decision No. 626 (1994), this office determined that the term "test item" in section 552.122 includes any standard means by which an individual's or group's knowledge or ability in a particular area is evaluated, but does not encompass evaluations of an employee's overall job performance or suitability. Whether information falls within the section 552.122 exception must be determined on a case-by-case basis. ORD 626 at 6. Having reviewed the information at issue, we agree that it constitutes "test items" as contemplated by section 552.122(b). Therefore, the city may withhold Exhibit C-2 under section 552.122(b).

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information [that] relates to... a motor vehicle operator’s or driver’s license or permit issued by an agency of this state [or] a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state.” Gov’t Code § 552.130(a)(1), (2). Thus, the city must withhold the Texas driver’s license and motor vehicle registration information you have marked under section 552.130.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” Gov’t Code § 552.136. The city must withhold the information that we have marked under section 552.136. We note that a tax identification number is not an access device number for purposes of section 552.136. As you have not explained how the remaining numbers you have marked under section 552.136 are access device numbers for purposes of this section, none of the remaining information may be withheld on this basis.

Finally, we note that a portion of the remaining information appears to be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city may withhold the information in Exhibit C-2 under section 552.122 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the marked information under sections 552.130 and 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released, but any copyrighted information may only be released in accordance with copyright law.<sup>1</sup>

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

---

<sup>1</sup>We note that the submitted information 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 under the Act.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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).

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 Office of the Attorney General 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,



Paige Savoie  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PS/ma

Ref: ID# 293262

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Rick Ward  
714 West Magnolia  
Fort Worth, Texas 76104  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Jackie D. Bewley  
President  
Irving Holdings, Inc. d/b/a Yellow Cab Co.  
2200 South Riverside Drive  
Fort Worth, Texas 76104  
(w/o enclosures)