



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 22, 2019

Ms. Alicia K. Kreh  
Counsel for the City of Kennedale  
Taylor, Olson, Adkins, Sralla & Elam, L.L.P.  
6000 Western Place, Suite 200  
Fort Worth, Texas 76107-4654

OR2019-29793

Dear Ms. Kreh:

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# 792616.

The City of Kennedale (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for information pertaining to a specified address and a particular meeting. You state the city will release some information. You state the city is withholding motor vehicle record information pursuant to section 552.130(c) of the Government Code, social security numbers pursuant to section 552.147(b) of the Government Code, and certain information pursuant to the previous determination issued in Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).<sup>1</sup> You claim portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 of the Government Code. You also state you notified Champion Life Safety Solutions, LLC; Pennington Family Ltd. Partnership; and Ashton Holdings, Inc. of the request for information and of the 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

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See id.* § 552.130(d), (e). 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. *See id.* § 552.147(b). Open Records Decision No. 684 is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the exception you claim 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 under section 552.305(d) of the Government Code 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, we have not received comments from any third party explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any third party 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 the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest a third party may have in the information.

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. 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 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), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). 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 a portion of the submitted information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Thus, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code

in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find no portion of the remaining information is highly intimate or embarrassing information of an individual that is of no legitimate public concern, and the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

We understand you marked to withhold a personal e-mail address pursuant to section 552.137 of the Government Code and Open Records Decision No. 684. Section 552.137 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses at issue are not types specifically excluded by section 552.137(c) of the Government Code. Accordingly, the city must withhold the e-mail address you marked, as well as the additional e-mail addresses we have marked, under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their disclosure.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states “[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.”<sup>2</sup> *Id.* § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device for purposes of this exception. Thus, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the e-mail address you marked, as well as the additional e-mail addresses we have marked, under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their disclosure. The city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city 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 <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>2</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).

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,



Erin Groff  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

EMG/jxd

Ref: ID# 792616

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

3 Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)