



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 12, 2019

Mr. Mark Kratovil
Assistant Criminal District Attorney
Tarrant County
401 West Belknap
Fort Worth, Texas 76196

OR2019-31819

Dear Mr. Kratovil:

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# 796436.

The Tarrant County Purchasing Department (the "county") received two requests from different requestors for information pertaining to request for proposals 2019-002.¹ You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Dominion Voting Systems, Inc.; Electronic Systems and Software, LLC ("ESS"); and Hart Intercivic, Inc. ("Hart"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue 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 Hart and ESS. We have also received and considered comments from the second requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general

¹ We note the county sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-business-day period to request attorney general opinion is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

reasons why requested information should or should not be released). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the county's obligations under the Act. Section 552.301 of the Government Code prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. *See id.* § 552.301. Pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *Id.* § 552.301(e). In this instance, you state the county received the second request for information on August 12, 2019, and received clarification September 9, 2019. Thus, the county's fifteen-business-day deadline to provide the information required by section 552.301(e) of the Government Code was September 30, 2019. The county asserts it initially mailed a portion of the information required by section 552.301(e) on September 30, 2019, but the envelope was returned for insufficient postage. The county again submitted the required information to this office, and that envelope is postmarked October 8, 2019. *See id.* § 552.308(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Section 552.308 of the Government Code provides, when a submission within a specified time period is required under the Act, the time requirement is met if the submission is sent by first class mail "with postage . . . prepaid" and the postmark date is within the required time period. *See id.* § 552.308(a). Consequently, we conclude the county failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (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). You claim sections 552.107 and 552.111 of the Government Code for the information at issue. Because section 552.107 of the Government Code can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will address the applicability of this section for the information at issue. However, we find you have failed to establish a compelling reason to address your remaining argument.

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 any remaining third party explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any remaining third party 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 county may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest any remaining third party may have in the information.

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). 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. Hart states it has competitors. Hart states release of its information would give advantage to its competitors. 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 Hart has established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the county may withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.²

Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “to facilitate the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337,

² As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining arguments against disclosure of this information.

340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a *confidential* communication, *Id.*, meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those: (A) to whom disclosure is made to further the rendition of professional legal services to the client; or (B) reasonably necessary to transmit the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the *intent* of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You state the information at issue consists of communications between attorneys for the county and employees of several county departments. You state the information at issue was communicated for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the county, was intended for internal distribution only, and has remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find you have demonstrated the applicability of the attorney-client privilege to the information at issue. Thus, the county may generally withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. We note, however, some of these e-mail strings include e-mails and attachments received from and sent to parties with whom you have not demonstrated the county shares a privileged relationship. Furthermore, if the e-mails and attachments received from and sent to non-privileged parties are removed from the e-mail strings and stand alone, they are responsive to the second request for information. Therefore, if the non-privileged e-mails and attachments, which we have marked, are maintained by the county separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the county may not withhold these non-privileged e-mails under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information 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 county may withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The county may generally withhold the information you marked under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code; however, if the non-privileged e-mails and attachments we indicated are maintained by the county separate and apart from the otherwise privileged e-mail strings in which they appear, then the county must release that information. The county must release the remaining information; 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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Kelly McWethy
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KM/jxd

Ref: ID# 796436

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

3 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)