



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 24, 2019

Mr. David Lozano
General Counsel for Sharyland Independent School District
Jones, Galligan, Key & Lozano, L.L.P.
P.O. Box 1247
Weslaco, Texas 78599-1247

OR2019-13870

Dear Mr. Lozano:

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# 767360.

The Sharyland Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for the district's insurance coverage with a named company during a specified policy period. Although the district takes no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, the district states release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Carlisle Insurance Agency, Inc. ("Carlisle"). Accordingly, the district states, and provides documentation showing, it notified Carlisle of the request for information and of the 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 received comments from Carlisle. We have reviewed the submitted arguments and the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments from the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

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). 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). 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.” *Id.* at 841. Carlisle states it has competitors. In addition, Carlisle states the submitted information includes a suite of “insurance programs . . . that are proprietary and specific to Carlisle . . . that [are] developed . . . in-house” and tailored to the district. Carlisle asserts release of the submitted information would cause the company harm by providing its competitors “a one-sided advantage.” 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, Carlisle 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 submitted information under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code on behalf of Carlisle.¹

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

¹As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Lecelle Clarke', written in a cursive style.

Lecelle Clarke
Attorney
Open Records Division

LC/mo

Ref: ID# 767360

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party
(w/o enclosures)