



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 6, 2005

Mr. Bertha A. Ontiveros
Assistant County Attorney
El Paso County
500 East San Antonio, Room 503
El Paso, Texas 79901

OR2005-10924

Dear Ms. Ontiveros:

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# 237619.

The El Paso County Bail Bond Board (the "board") received a request for all information related to a named individual and/or Freedom Bail Bonds ("Freedom"). You state that you have released some of the requested information. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. You also claim that the submitted information may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified the interested third-party Freedom of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released. *See Gov't Code § 552.305(d); see also Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under Act in certain circumstances).* We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that 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 requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B).* As of the date of this letter, Freedom has not submitted any comments to this office explaining how release of the submitted

information would affect its proprietary interests. Therefore, Freedom has provided us with no basis to conclude that it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See, e.g., id.* § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). Thus, none of the submitted information may be withheld based on the proprietary interest of Freedom.

We now turn to the board's claim under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the doctrine of common law privacy. Common law privacy protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). This office has previously determined that "all financial information relating to an individual . . . ordinarily satisfies the first requirement of common law privacy, in that it constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing facts about the individual, such that its public disclosure would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities." Open Records Decision No. 373 at 3. However this office also found that a legitimate public interest can exist in such financial information. *Id.*

In this instance, you state that the submitted information consists of financial statements submitted to the board as part of an application for a bail bondsman license. Based on our review of your arguments and the information at issue, we find that, although the submitted information arguably satisfies the first prong of the *Industrial Foundation* test, we believe the public has a legitimate interest in this type of information. *Cf. Apodaca v. Montes*, 606 S.W.2d 734 (Tex. Civ. App.—El Paso 1980, no writ) (constitutional right of privacy does not protect personal financial information filed with county bail bond board as required to obtain a license to act as bondsman; recognizing public interest in such information). We therefore conclude that none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with common law privacy. As you claim no additional exceptions to disclosure, and the submitted information is not otherwise confidential by law, the board must release this information to the requestor.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the

governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Caroline E. Cho
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CEC/sdk

Ref: ID# 237619

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Andres E. Almanzan
Mounce, Green, Myers, Safi & Galatzan
100 North Stanton, Suite 1700
El Paso, Texas 79901-1448
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Pascual Olibas
P.O. Box 220324
El Paso, Texas 79913
(w/o enclosures)