



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 18, 2020

Ms. Karen Strand
Senior Assistant City Attorney
City of Mesquite
P.O. Box 850137
Mesquite, Texas 75185-0137

OR2020-08540

Dear Ms. Strand:

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# 816951.

The City of Mesquite (the "city") received a request for policies, contracts, agreements, and certain video requests regarding a specified program, including certain warrant information during a stated time period. We understand the city does not have information responsive to portions of the request.¹ Although the city takes no position regarding whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under the Act, the city informs us its release may implicate the proprietary interests of Ring, LLC ("Ring"). Accordingly, the city states, and provides documentation showing, it notified Ring of the request for information and of 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 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 Ring explaining why the information at issue should not

¹ The Act does not require a governmental body to create or release information that did not exist when a request for information was received. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266, 267-68 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

be released. Thus, we have no basis to conclude Ring 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, 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. Therefore, the city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Ring may have in the information. As no exceptions to disclosure are raised, the city must release the submitted 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 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,

James M. Graham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JMG/rm

Ref: ID# 816951

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

cc: Third Party
(w/o enclosures)