



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 18, 2017

Mr. Dean Micknal  
Counsel for Duncanville Independent School District  
Leasor Crass, P.C.  
302 West Broad Street  
Mansfield, Texas 76063

OR2017-16025

Dear Mr. Micknal:

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# 666700.

The Duncanville Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received two requests from different requestors for information pertaining to a specified request for proposal ("RFP") and information relating to the resulting contract. You state the district has released some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.104, and 552.139 of the Government Code. You also state you notified AT&T and Unite Private Networks ("UPN") of the requests for information and of their rights 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 received comments from UPN. We have considered the submitted 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 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 ruling, we have not received comments from AT&T. Thus, we have no basis to conclude AT&T has a protected proprietary interest in 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 any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest AT&T may have in the information.

Next, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides, in relevant part, the following:

(a) [T]he following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure unless made confidential under this chapter or other law:

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3). The submitted information includes a contract relating to the expenditure of funds by a governmental body that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3). The district must release this information pursuant to section 552.022(a)(3), unless it is made confidential under the Act or other law. *See id.* § 552.022(a)(3). Although the district raises section 552.103 of the Government Code for this information, section 552.103 is discretionary in nature and does not make information confidential under the Act. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit*, 4 S.W.3d at 475-76 (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decisions 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions). Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the information subject to section 552.022(a)(3) under section 552.103. However, section 552.101 of the Government Code protects information made confidential under law and section 552.139 makes information confidential under the Act. Therefore, we will consider the district's arguments under these exceptions for the information subject to section 552.022. You and UPN claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.104. Section 552.104(b) provides, however, that information encompassed by section 552.022 may be withheld under section 552.104(a). *See Gov't Code* § 552.104(b) (information protected by section 552.104 not subject to required disclosure under section 552.022(a)). Accordingly, we will consider the submitted arguments under section 552.104. Further, we will consider UPN's arguments under section 552.110, as that exception makes information confidential under the Act for purposes of section 552.022. We will also consider the district's assertion of 552.103 for the information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code.

Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

*Id.* § 552.103(a), (c). The purpose of section 552.103 is to enable a governmental body to protect its position in litigation by forcing parties to obtain information relating to litigation through discovery procedures. *See* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4-5 (1990). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show the section 552.103(a) exception applies in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date the governmental body received the request for information, and (2) the requested information is related to that litigation. *See Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, orig. proceeding); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); ORD 551 at 4. The governmental body must meet both parts of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a). *See* ORD 551 at 4.

The question of whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). To establish litigation is reasonably anticipated, the governmental body must furnish concrete evidence that litigation involving a specific matter is realistically contemplated and is more than mere conjecture. *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party.<sup>1</sup> Open

---

<sup>1</sup>In addition, this office has concluded litigation was reasonably anticipated when the potential opposing party took the following objective steps toward litigation: filed a complaint with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, *see* Open Records Decision No. 336 (1982); hired an attorney who made a demand for disputed payments and threatened to sue if the payments were not made promptly, *see* Open Records Decision No. 346 (1982); and threatened to sue on several occasions and hired an attorney, *see* Open Records Decision No. 288 (1981).

Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be “realistically contemplated”). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982).

You contend litigation was reasonably anticipated on the date the district received the requests because in her request, the second requestor simultaneously notified the district that its company was protesting the award of the RFP. Upon review, we find the district has failed to demonstrate any individual had taken objective steps towards filing suit prior to the district receiving the requests. Therefore, we conclude the district has not demonstrated litigation was reasonably anticipated on the date the instant request was received. Therefore, the information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104(a). The “test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder’s [or competitor’s information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage.” *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831, 841 (Tex. 2015). In considering whether a private third party may assert this exception, the supreme court reasoned because section 552.305(a) of the Government Code includes section 552.104 as an example of an exception that involves a third party’s property interest, a private third party may invoke this exception. *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015). You state release of the submitted information would advantage the requestors in future bidding for district projects. While you argue release of the submitted information would harm participating entities in future bidding situations by giving an advantage to their competitors, such an interest in protecting the information belongs to the participating entities and not the district. However, UPN states it has competitors and that release of some of its information would provide its competitors with a substantial advantage in future bidding processes. We note UPN was the winning bidder. For many years, this office concluded the terms of a contract and especially the pricing of a winning bidder are public and generally not excepted from disclosure. Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency), 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors), 494 (1988) (requiring balancing of public interest in disclosure with competitive injury to company). *See generally* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). However, now, pursuant to *Boeing*, section 552.104 is not limited to only ongoing competitive situations, and a third party need only show release of its competitively sensitive information would give an advantage to a competitor even after a contract is executed. *Boeing*, 466 S.W.3d at 831, 839. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find UPN has established the release of the

information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the district may withhold the information we marked under section 552.104(a).<sup>2</sup>

Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure “an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body,” unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)-(c). Section 552.137 does not apply to an institutional e-mail address, the general e-mail address of a business, an e-mail address of a person who has a contractual relationship with a governmental body, an e-mail address of a vendor who seeks to contract with a governmental body, an e-mail address maintained by a governmental entity for one of its officials or employees, or an e-mail address provided to a governmental body on a letterhead. *See id.* § 552.137(c). We are unable to determine whether the personal e-mail addresses within the submitted information at issue, which are located within e-mails communicating official business of the district, belong to district officials or employees. Thus, we rule conditionally. To the extent the e-mail addresses we marked are the personal e-mail addresses of district officials or employees, or to the extent subsection (c) applies, this information is not subject to section 552.137 and may not be withheld on that basis. *See Austin Bulldog v. Leffingwell*, 490 S.W.3d 240 (Tex. App.—Austin 2016, no pet.) (holding personal e-mail addresses of government officials used to conduct official government business are not e-mail addresses of “members of the public” for purposes of Gov’t Code § 552.137(a)). However, to the extent the e-mail addresses we marked are not the personal e-mail addresses of district officials or employees and subsection (c) does not apply, this information is subject to section 552.137 and must be withheld under section 552.137, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release.

Section 552.139 of the Government Code provides:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information that relates to computer network security, to restricted information under Section 2059.055 [of the Government Code], or to the design, operation, or defense of a computer network.

Gov’t Code § 552.139(a). Section 2059.055 of the Government Code provides in pertinent part:

(b) Network security information is confidential under this section if the information is:

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address UPN’s remaining arguments against disclosure.

- (1) related to passwords, personal identification numbers, access codes, encryption, or other components of the security system of a state agency;
- (2) collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental entity to prevent, detect, or investigate criminal activity; or
- (3) related to an assessment, made by or for a governmental entity or maintained by a governmental entity, of the vulnerability of a network to criminal activity.

*Id.* § 2059.055(b). You assert portions of the remaining information “discloses specific details regarding the design and operation of the district’s computer network.” Based on your representations and our review, we find section 552.139 is applicable to the some of the information at issue. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.139 of the Government Code. However, you have not demonstrated any of the remaining information relates to the specifics of the districts’s computer network security, or to the design, operation, or defense of the district’s computer network as contemplated in section 552.139(a). Thus, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.139 of the Government Code.

You note, and we agree, some of the remaining materials at issue may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; see Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the district may withhold the information we marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. To the extent the e-mail addresses we marked are not the personal e-mail addresses of district officials or employees and subsection (c) does not apply, this information is subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code and must be withheld under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release. The district must withhold the information we marked under section 552.139 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released; however, any information protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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](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,



Emily Kunst  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

EK/eb

Ref: ID# 666700

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

2 Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)