



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 23, 2015

Mr. M. Matthew Ribitzki
Deputy City Attorney
City of Burleson
141 West Renfro
Burleson, Texas 76028

OR2015-05438

Dear Mr. Ribitzki:

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# 557134.

The City of Burleson (the "city") received a request for information related to a specified address, to include reports, inspections, and surveys of the specified address. You state you will provide some information to the requestor. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the requested information, you state the proprietary interests of certain third parties might be implicated. Accordingly, you notified Asbestos Inspectors, Inc., and Texas Mold Inspection Service of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office explaining why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information.

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received arguments from either third party. Thus, neither third party has demonstrated it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See*

id. § 552.110(a)–(b); 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 the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests either third party may have in the information. As you raise no exceptions to disclosure, the submitted information must be released.

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 http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Joseph Behnke
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JB/som

Ref: ID# 556999

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Texas Mold Inspection Service
3011 Hood Street, Suite 102
Dallas, Texas 75219
(w/o enclosures)

Asbestos Inspectors, Inc.
P.O. Box 195014
Dallas, Texas 75219
(w/o enclosures)