



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 10, 2020

Mr. Joseph Behnke
Assistant General Counsel
Office of the Governor
P.O. Box 12428
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2020-01084

Dear Mr. Behnke:

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# 805666 (OOG ID# 433-19).

The Office of the Governor (the "governor's office") received a request for proposals and scoring documents related to a specified bidding opportunity. You state the governor's office released some information. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Aerial Public Relations ("Aerial"), Citizen Relations LP, and VoX International ("VoX"). 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 submitted information should not be released. *See Gov't Code* § 552.305; *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 Aerial and VoX. 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 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 the remaining third party explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude the 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 governor's office may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the remaining third party may have in it.

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. Aerial and VoX each state they have competitors. In addition, Aerial and VoX each state release of their information at issue would give an advantage to its competitors. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find Aerial and VoX have established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the governor's office may withhold the information we indicated under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.¹

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." 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 relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally intimate or embarrassing. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 523 (1989) (common-law privacy protects credit reports, financial statements, and other personal financial information), 373 (1983) (sources of income not related to financial transaction between individual and governmental body protected under common-law privacy). However, the doctrine of common-law privacy protects the privacy interests of individuals, not of corporations or other types of business organizations. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); *see also Rosen v.*

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

Matthews Constr. Co., 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989) (corporation has no right to privacy (citing *United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950))), *rev'd on other grounds*, 196 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990).

VoX raises section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy for a portion of its remaining information. Upon review, however, we find VoX has failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public interest. Thus, the governor's office may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note some of the remaining information appears to 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 Nos. 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 copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the governor's office may withhold the information we indicated under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The governor's office must release the remaining information; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only 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,



Matthew Taylor
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MHT/mo