



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 29, 2017

Mr. Jonathan Ellzey
Assistant District Attorney
Wichita County
900 Seventh Street
Wichita Falls, Texas 76301-2482

OR2017-19758

Dear Mr. Ellzey:

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# 673508 (ORR No. 1272).

The Wichita County Sheriff's Office (the "sheriff's office") received a request for all responses and financial offers received pertaining to a specified request for proposals. You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. You also state you notified City Tele-Coin Company, Inc.; Correct Solutions Group; IC Solutions ("IC"); and Securus Technologies ("Securus") of the request for information and of their rights 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 received comments from IC and Securus. We have considered the submitted arguments and 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 ruling, we have not received comments from City Tele-Coin Company, Inc. or Correct Solutions Group. Thus, we have no basis to conclude these third parties have a protected

proprietary interest in 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 sheriff's office may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest City Tele-Coin Company, Inc. or Correct Solutions Group may have in the information.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). In considering whether a private third party may assert this exception, the supreme court reasoned because section 552.305(a) of the Government Code includes section 552.104 as an example of an exception that involves a third party's property interest, a private third party may invoke this exception. *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015). The "test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder's [or competitor's information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage." *Id.* at 841. Securus and IC state they have competitors. In addition, Securus states release of this information would provide its competitors with a competitive advantage in future bidding processes. IC states release would harm the company because it would allow "an extreme competitive advantage to a competitor. . . because. . . it [could] adjust its competitive strategies, actions, and bidding accordingly." After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find Securus and IC have established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the sheriff's office may withhold Securus' information in its entirety and Exhibit I of IC's information under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.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." Gov't Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) 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 satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (employee's designation of retirement beneficiary, choice

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the sheriff's office's argument against disclosure of this information.

of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information). We note 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 Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989) (corporation has no right to privacy (citing *United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950))), *rev'd on other grounds*, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990). Upon review, we find no portion of the remaining information belongs to an individual and may not be withheld under section 552.101 on the basis of common-law privacy.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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.”² Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the sheriff’s office must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the sheriff’s office may withhold Securus’ information in its entirety and Exhibit I of IC’s information under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The sheriff’s office must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the submitted information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The sheriff’s office must release the remaining information.


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

²The 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).

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Emily Kunst". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Emily Kunst
Attorney
Open Records Division

EK/eb

Ref: ID# 673508

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

4 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)