



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

October 29, 2019

Mr. Thomas Royce Hansen  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of Fort Worth  
200 Texas Street, 3rd Floor  
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-6311

OR2019-30545

Dear Mr. Hansen:

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# 793709 (PIR No. W089106).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to two specified public accommodation charges. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.137 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Varsity Tavern ("Varsity"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, the city notified Varsity of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released.<sup>1</sup> *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory

---

<sup>1</sup> We note, and you acknowledge, the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Nonetheless, section 552.101 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness caused by failure to comply with section 552.301. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302. Thus, we will address the applicability of this exception to the submitted information, notwithstanding the city's violation of section 552.301 in requesting this decision. Further, because third-party interests can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness caused by a failure to comply with section 552.301, we will consider any third party's arguments against disclosure of the information at issue.

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 Varsity. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note the city has redacted portions of the submitted information. You do not assert, nor does our review of the records indicate, the city is authorized to withhold the information you redacted without seeking a ruling from this office. *See id.* § 552.301(a); Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001). Therefore, information must be submitted in a manner that enables this office to determine whether the information comes within the scope of an exception to disclosure. In this instance, we are able to discern the nature of the redacted information; thus, being deprived of this information does not inhibit our ability to make a ruling. In the future, however, the city should refrain from redacting any information that it is not authorized to withhold in seeking an open records ruling. Failure to do so may result in the presumption the redacted information is public. *See* Gov't Code § 552.302.

Varsity raises section 552.102(a) of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure of portions of the submitted information. Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure "information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]" *Id.* § 552.102(a). Section 552.102(a) protects information relating to public officials and employees. *See* Open Records Decision No. 345 (1982). In this instance, the information at issue is related to a private entity, Varsity. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the information Varsity seeks to withhold under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

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). 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. Varsity states it has competitors. Varsity further asserts release of portions of the information at issue would give its competitors an advantage by undermining Varsity's business strategy and allowing its employees to be poached. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find Varsity has established the release of the information at issue, which we marked, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address Varsity's remaining arguments against disclosure of this 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. Additionally, this office has found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally private. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (personal financial information includes choice of a particular insurance carrier), 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). The court of appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *See Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at \*3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.).

Upon review, we conclude some of the remaining information meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. We note the requestor has a right of access to her client’s date of birth. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.023(a) (“person or a person’s authorized representative has special right of access, beyond right of general public, to information held by governmental body that relates to person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person’s privacy interests”); Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987) (privacy theories not implicated when individual requests information concerning herself). Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we marked and, with the exception of the requestor’s client’s date of birth, all public citizens’ dates of birth 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 and 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.

Varsity asserts some of the remaining information is confidential under constitutional privacy. Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of constitutional privacy. Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual’s interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. ORD 455 at 4. The first type protects an individual’s autonomy within “zones of privacy” which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual’s privacy interests and the public’s need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of

privacy; the information must concern the “most intimate aspects of human affairs.” *Id.* at 5 (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). After review of the remaining information, we find Varsity has not demonstrated how any portion of the information at issue falls within the zones of privacy or implicates an individual’s privacy interests for purposes of constitutional privacy. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 on the basis of constitutional privacy.

Varsity also asserts some of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 31.05 of the Penal Code. Section 31.05 of the Penal Code provides, in pertinent part:

(b) A person commits an offense if, without the owner's effective consent, he knowingly:

- (1) steals a trade secret;
- (2) makes a copy of an article representing a trade secret; or
- (3) communicates or transmits a trade secret.

(c) An offense under this section is a felony of the third degree.

Penal Code § 31.05(b), (c). We note section 31.05 does not expressly make information confidential. In order for section 552.101 to apply, a statute must contain language expressly making certain information confidential. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 658 at 4 (1998), 478 at 2 (1987), 465 at 4-5 (1987). Confidentiality cannot be implied from the structure of a statute or rule. *See* ORD 465 at 4-5. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 31.05 of the Penal Code.

Varsity also claims some of the remaining information is confidential under section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136(b) 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.” Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Upon review, we find some of the information at issue, which we marked, is subject to section 552.136. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information may be subject to section 552.117 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from

---

<sup>3</sup> The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481, 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

disclosure the current and former home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. *Id.* § 552.117(a)(1). Section 552.117(a)(1) also applies to the personal cellular telephone number of a current or former official or employee of a governmental body, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for this information was made. Accordingly, to the extent the employees whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone number if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. Conversely, to the extent the employees whose information is at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024, the city may not withhold the marked information under section 552.117(a)(1).

Section 552.130 of the Government Code provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title or registration, or personal identification document issued by an agency of this state or another state or country is excepted from public release. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130. Accordingly, the city must withhold all visible license plates within the remaining information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

We understand the city will redact information subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code in accordance with Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009).<sup>4</sup> 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). *Id.* § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address of a vendor who seeks to contract with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body on a letterhead. *See id.* § 552.137(c). We note you seek to withhold the private e-mail address of a government employee who used their private e-mail address to conduct official government business. However, in *Austin Bulldog v. Leffingwell*, 490 S.W.3d 240 (Tex.

---

<sup>4</sup> Open Records Decision No. 684 serves as a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold certain categories of information, including personal e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. *See* ORD 684.

App.—Austin 2016, no pet.), the court concluded section 552.137 does not except from disclosure the private e-mail addresses of government officials who use their private e-mail addresses to conduct official government business. *See Austin Bulldog*, 490 S.W.2d at 491. Therefore, upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the employee's personal e-mail address you marked is excepted under section 552.137. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the e-mail address at issue on that basis. Upon review, however, we find the city must withhold the remaining e-mail addresses you marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure or subsection (c) applies.

We note some of the remaining information at issue appears to be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.


In summary, the city may withhold the information we marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we marked and, with the exception of the requestor's client's date of birth, all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. To the extent the employees whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code, the city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code; however, the city may only withhold the marked cellular telephone number if the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. The city must withhold all visible license plates under section 552.130 of the Government Code. With the exception of the city employee's personal e-mail address, the city must withhold the e-mail addresses you marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless their owners affirmatively consent to their public disclosure or subsection (c) applies. The city must release the remaining information; however, the city may only release any information subject to copyright in accordance with copyright law.

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

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,



Kieran Hillis  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KH/gw

Ref: ID# 793709

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

c: Third Party  
(w/o enclosures)