



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 28, 2014

Ms. Elaine Nicholson
Assistant City Attorney
City of Austin
P.O. Box 1088
Austin, Texas 78767-8828

OR2014-01610

Dear Ms. Nicholson:

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# 512635.

The City of Austin (the "city") received a request for a specified EEOC complaint file. We understand the city is releasing some information to the requestor. 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 The Scottish Rite Theater ("Scottish Rite"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Scottish Rite of the request for information and of its 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.

Initially, we note, and you acknowledge, the city has not complied with the time periods prescribed by section 552.301 of the Government Code in seeking an open records decision from this office. Gov't Code § 552.301. When a governmental body fails to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301, the information at issue is presumed public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold it. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); *see also* Open Records

Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a governmental body may demonstrate a compelling reason to withhold information by a showing the information is made confidential by another source of law or affects third party interests. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Because third party interests are at stake in this instance, we will consider whether the information at issue must be withheld under the Act.

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 Scottish Rite explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude Scottish Rite has a protected proprietary interest in 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. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Scottish Rite 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."¹ Gov't Code § 552.101. 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. This office has found that personal financial information not related to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (employee's designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 545 (1990) (deferred compensation information, mortgage payments, assets, bills, and credit history protected under common-law privacy), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). Upon review, we find some of the submitted information satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information at issue, a representative sample of which we have marked, under

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. As no other exceptions to disclosure are raised, the city must release the remaining submitted information.²

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Cynthia G. Tynan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CGT/akg

Ref: ID# 512635

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Todd Smith
The Scottish Rite Theater
207 West 18th Street
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

²We note the information being released in this instance includes information pertaining to the requestor's client that may be confidential with respect to the general public. *See* Gov't Code § 552.023(a) (governmental body may not deny access to person to whom information relates or person's agent on ground that information is considered confidential by privacy principles); ORD 481 at 4 (privacy theories not implicated when individuals request information concerning themselves). Therefore, if the city receives another request for this information from a different requestor, the city must again seek a ruling from this office.