



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 6, 2022

Mr. Daniel D. Jones  
City Attorney  
City of Fredericksburg  
126 West Main Street  
Fredericksburg, Texas 78624-3708

OR2022-10037

Dear Mr. Jones:

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# 941515.

The City of Fredericksburg (the "city") received a request for the building plans and permits for a specified building. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Avenu Insights & Analytics, LLC, and Granicus, LLC. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified the third parties of the request for information and of their 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 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.

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 the notified third parties explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude those parties have protected proprietary interests in the submitted information. *See, e.g., id.* § 552.110 (requiring the provision of specific factual evidence demonstrating the

applicability of the exception). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the remaining third parties may have in the information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.”<sup>1</sup> *Id.* § 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. *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.). In this instance, we are unable to determine whether some of the information at issue pertains to an actual living individual or fictitious individual. Therefore, we must rule conditionally. Accordingly, to the extent the date of birth in the remaining information pertains to a real, living, identifiable individual, the city must withhold the date of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the information at issue does not pertain to a real, living, identifiable individual, the city may not withhold this information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.136(b) 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 § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the date of birth in the remaining information pertains to a real, living, identifiable individual, the city must withhold the date of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The city must withhold the insurance policy numbers we 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

---

<sup>1</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,

Sarah E. Reese  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

SER/jm

Ref: ID# 941515

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)