



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 29, 2020

Mr. Reggie Hollins  
Legal Technology Specialist  
City of Plano  
P.O. Box 860358  
Plano, Texas 75086-0358

OR2020-14915

Dear Mr. Hollins:

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# 830802 (File No. PKR-R002740).

The City of Plano (the "city") received a request for all information regarding agreements with companies for specified services during a stated time period. 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 the following third parties: Bounce 'N' More, LLC; Jumper Bee Entertainment, LLC; Let's Jump Rentals; Starwalk of Dallas; Texas Entertainment Group; and Texas Sumo. Accordingly, the city states, and provides documentation showing, it notified these third parties of the request for information and of their 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).* Further, we understand release of the information at issue may implicate the proprietary interests of Architects of Air. Accordingly, pursuant to section 552.305, the city was also required to notify this interested third party of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office. *See Gov't Code § 552.305(d); see also ORD 542.* We have reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we indicated, is not responsive to the instant request because it does not consist of information regarding agreements with companies for the specified services. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request, and the city is not required to release such information in response to this request.

Next, we note 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 interested third party explaining why the information at issue should not be released. Thus, we have no basis to conclude any of the interested third parties have a protected proprietary interest in the information at issue. *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 information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest any interested third party may have in the information.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from 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 or officials of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> Gov't Code § 552.117(a)(1). We note section 552.117 is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 506 at 5-6 (1988) (section 552.117 is not applicable to cellular telephone numbers paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Whether a particular item of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 530 at 5 (1989). Thus, information may be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) only on behalf of a current or former employee or official who made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request for the information. Information may not be withheld under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee or official who did not timely request under section 552.024 the information be kept confidential. Accordingly, if the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the city must withhold the cellular telephone number we indicated under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. Conversely, if the individual at issue did not timely request confidentiality under section 552.024 or the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body, the city may not withhold the indicated information under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 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.” Gov't Code

---

<sup>1</sup> The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

§ 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Accordingly, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers within the remaining responsive information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, if the individual whose information is at issue timely requested confidentiality under section 552.024 of the Government Code and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the city must withhold the cellular telephone number we indicated under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the insurance policy numbers within the remaining responsive information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining responsive 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/be

Ref: ID# 830802

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

cc: 7 Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)