



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 3, 2016

Mr. John J. Janssen
General Counsel
Corpus Christi Independent School District
P.O. Box 110
Corpus Christi, Texas 78403

OR2016-02656

Dear Mr. Janssen:

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# 596820.

The Corpus Christi Independent School District (the "district") received a request for information related to the winning bidder in a specified request for proposals. You state you have released some information. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under the Act, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Elegant Enterprise Wide Solutions, Inc. ("Elegant"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Elegant 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 an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received arguments from Elegant. Thus, Elegant has not demonstrated it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See*

id. § 552.110(a)–(b); 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 district may not withhold Elegant’s information on the basis of any proprietary interests it may have in the information.

We note portions of the submitted information are subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.¹ Section 552.136 states, “notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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 also id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device number for the purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Accordingly, the district must withhold the insurance policy number within the submitted information under section 552.136. The remaining information must be released.

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,



Mili Gosar
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MG/akg

¹The 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).

Ref: ID# 596820

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Priyanka Arora
Elegant Enterprise Wide Solutions
25961 Hartwood Drive
Chantilly, Virginia 20152
(w/o enclosures)