



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 23, 2022

Ms. Aliceson Cotton  
Counsel for the City of Frisco  
Abernathy, Roeder, Boyd & Hullett, P.C.  
1700 Redbud Boulevard, Suite 300  
McKinney, Texas 75069

OR2022-25315

Dear Ms. Cotton:

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# 967674 (Ref. No. G058417).

The City of Frisco (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for certain tax and incentives agreements pertaining to specified projects. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of specified third parties.<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, the city states, and provides documentation showing, it notified these parties of the request for information and of the 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

---

<sup>1</sup> You inform us the district notified the following third parties: Aaron Sherman; Haynes and Boone LLP; HP Frisco Holdings, Inc; Jackson Walker LLP; Kirkland & Ellis LLP; Omni Stillwater Woods Golf Resort LLC; Stillwater Capital; The Professional Golfers' Association of America; and Winstead PC.

third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the exception you claim 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) 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 the notified third parties have 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). Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the notified 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." *Id.* § 552.101.<sup>2</sup> 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. The Third 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.). Thus, the city must withhold the dates of birth of public citizens under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, none of the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information must be released.

---

<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).

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,

Michelle Garza  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

MRG/jxd

Ref: ID# 967674

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

10 Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)