



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

August 31, 2009

Mr. Gene McCullough  
Open Records Officer, Valley International Airport  
McCullough and McCullough  
P.O. Box 2244  
Harlingen, Texas 78551-2244

OR2009-12289

Dear Mr. McCullough:

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# 354119.

The Valley International Airport (the "airport"), which you represent, received a request for all documents, correspondence, requests for information, ethics inquiries, and ethics complaints pertaining to a request by Sun Valley Aviation ("Sun Valley") or a named individual to open a fixed base operator business at the airport, as well as any documents related to an ethics investigation pertaining to the request by Sun Valley. You inform this office that you do not maintain information responsive to the portion of the request seeking ethics inquiries, ethics complaints, or any documents related to the specified ethics investigation.<sup>1</sup> You claim that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Further, you state that release of the information at issue may implicate the proprietary interests of Sun Valley. You inform us, and provide documentation showing, that pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, the airport has notified Sun Valley of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office explaining why the submitted information should not be released.

---

<sup>1</sup>We note that the Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request or create responsive information. See *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dism'd); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 555 at 1 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983).

*See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *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 in certain circumstances). We have considered your arguments 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 Sun Valley explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that Sun Valley has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *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, that 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 (1990).

We understand the airport to assert that the submitted information is confidential because Sun Valley marked the documents as such when they were submitted to the airport. We note that information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party that submits the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot overrule or repeal provisions of the Act through an agreement or contract. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract.”), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Next, you assert that disclosure of Sun Valley's business plan would “amount to invasion of privacy through the disclosure of private facts.” Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” This section encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy, which 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). The types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and

injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. We note that common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals, not those of corporations and other types of business organizations. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); *see also* *U. S. v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950) (cited in *Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989), *rev'd on other grounds*, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990)) (corporation has no right to privacy). Accordingly, Sun Valley's information is not protected by common-law privacy and none of it may be withheld on that basis under section 552.101 of the Government Code. As you raise no further exceptions to disclosure of the submitted information, it must be released to the requestor.

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 [http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

Sincerely,



Adam Leiber  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ACL/rl

Ref: ID# 354119

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)