



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 17, 2020

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

OR2020-17906

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# 836025 (File No. PUR-R002974).

The City of Plano (the "city") received a request for the winning proposal pertaining to a specified bid. The city claims portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.136 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> Additionally, the city states release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Sciens Consulting, LLC ("Sciens"). Accordingly, the city states, and provides documentation showing, it notified Sciens 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 considered the claimed exception 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

---

<sup>1</sup> Although the city does not raise section 552.136 of the Government Code in its brief, we understand it to raise this exception based on its markings.

have not received comments from Sciens explaining why the information at issue should not be released. Thus, we have no basis to conclude Sciens has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See, e.g., id.* § 552.110 (requiring the provision of specific factual evidence demonstrating the applicability of the exception). Therefore, the city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Sciens may have in the information.

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.” *Id.* § 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 it marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.”<sup>2</sup> Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. 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.). Accordingly, the city must withhold the public citizen’s date of birth we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers it marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the public citizen’s date of birth we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. 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

---

<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).

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/mo

Ref: ID# 836025

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

cc: Third Party  
(w/o enclosures)