



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

September 16, 2019

Ms. Jennifer Burnett  
Senior Attorney & Public Information Coordinator  
The University of Texas System  
210 West 7th Street  
Austin, Texas 78701-2901

OR2019-25926

Dear Ms. Burnett:

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# 785954.

The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio (the "university") received a request for the winning proposal and bid tabulations pertaining to a specified request for proposals. Although you take no position regarding whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure, you state its release may implicate the proprietary interests of AMER Technology Inc. ("AMER"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified AMER of the request and its right to submit arguments to this office. *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.

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 AMER. Thus, we have no basis to conclude AMER has 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 university may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest AMER may have in the information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.”<sup>1</sup> 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 also 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. 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Upon review, we conclude the information we marked meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the university must withhold the information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. As we have received no further arguments against disclosure, the university must release the remaining information.<sup>2</sup>

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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable

---

<sup>1</sup> The 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).

<sup>2</sup> We note the remaining 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. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.147(b).

charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Emily Kunst". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the typed name.

Emily Kunst  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

EK/be

Ref: ID# 785954

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)