



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 7, 2012

Ms. Karen H. Brophy
Senior Assistant City Attorney
City of Irving
825 West Irving Boulevard
Irving, Texas 75060

OR2012-02003

Dear Ms. Brophy:

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# 444882.

The City of Irving (the "city") received a request for a specified list pertaining to a named company. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you inform us that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Heritage District L.L.C. ("Heritage"). Accordingly, we understand you notified Heritage of the request for information and of the company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information.

We note 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, Heritage has not submitted comments to this office explaining why any of the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that Heritage has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 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. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information based upon the proprietary interests of Heritage.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.”¹ Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is 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 established. *Id.* at 681-82. This office has found that personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally protected by common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992). We note, however, that common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals, not those of corporate and other business entities. *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 United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950) (cited in *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). In this instance, it is unclear whether the closing costs listed in the submitted information pertain to individuals or to corporate or business entities. Therefore, we must rule conditionally. If the closing costs pertain to property sellers who are individuals, then this information must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, if any of the closing costs pertain to property sellers that are corporate or business entities, it may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. As no exceptions to disclosure are raised for the remaining information, the city must release it.

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

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Kenneth Leland Conyer
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KLC/agn

Ref: ID# 444882

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Delbert McDougal
Heritage District, L.L.C.
5001 West Loop 289
Lubbock, Texas 79414
(w/o enclosures)