



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 13, 2022

Mr. Stephen Trautmann, Jr.
Counsel for the United Independent School District
Trautmann & Garcia, Attorneys at Law, PLLC
7110 Rocio Drive, #13
Laredo, Texas 78041

OR2022-10908

Dear Mr. Trautmann:

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# 939348 (Ref. No. R000441).

The United Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for proposals submitted in response to request for proposals number 076-2021. Although the district takes 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 Ed Tech Soft, Inc.; Edulastic; Illuminate Education; Imagine Learning, Inc. ("Imagine"); Otus, LLC; Territorium; Instructure, Inc.; Eduphoria! Inc.; Thinking Nation; and Classwork Co. d/b/a Classkick. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified the third parties 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 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances). We received comments from Imagine. We have considered the submitted arguments and 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 under section 552.305(d) of the Government Code 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 of the remaining third parties

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, e.g., id.* § 552.110 (requiring the provision of specific factual evidence demonstrating the applicability of the exception). Accordingly, the district may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the remaining third parties may have in the information.

Next, we understand Imagine to assert some of its information should be withheld because the information is subject to confidentiality agreements. Information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party that submits the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot overrule or repeal provisions of the Act through an agreement or contract. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract.”), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “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. *Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. Under the common-law right of privacy, an individual has a right to be free from the publicizing of private affairs in which the public has no legitimate concern. *Id.* at 682. The Third Court of Appeals has concluded public citizens’ dates of birth are protected by common-law privacy pursuant to section 552.101. *Paxton v. City of Dallas*, No. 03-13-00546-CV, 2015 WL 3394061, at *3 (Tex. App.—Austin May 22, 2015, pet. denied) (mem. op.). Thus, the district must withhold all public citizens’ dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Section 552.102(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy.” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). The Texas Supreme Court held section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure the dates of birth of state employees in the payroll database of the Texas Comptroller of Public Accounts. *Tex. Comptroller of Pub. Accounts v. Attorney Gen. of Tex.*, 354 S.W.3d 336 (Tex. 2010). Having carefully reviewed the information at issue, we find no portion of it is subject to section 552.102(a) of the Government Code, and the district may not withhold any of the remaining information on that basis.

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code states, “information is [excepted from required disclosure] if it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that the information is a trade secret.” *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). Section 552.110(a) defines a trade secret as all forms and types of information if:

(1) the owner of the trade secret has taken reasonable measures under the circumstances to keep the information secret; and

(2) the information derives independent economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to, and not being readily ascertainable through proper means by, another person who can obtain economic value from the disclosure or use of the information.

Id. § 552.110(a). Section 552.110(c) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “commercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]” *Id.* § 552.110(c). Imagine argues some of the information at issue consists of commercial or financial information subject to section 552.110(c). Upon review, we find Imagine demonstrated some of its information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.110 of the Government Code; however, to the extent the customer information is made available to the public by Imagine, including but not limited to on its website or social media accounts, it may not be withheld under 552.110.¹ However, we find Imagine failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating the remaining information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would result in substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code.

Imagine also argues some of the remaining information at issue consists of trade secrets subject to section 552.110(b). Upon review, however, we find Imagine failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating any portion of the remaining information at issue is a trade secret. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.1101 of the Government Code provides, in relevant part:

(a) . . . [I]nformation submitted to a governmental body by a vendor, contractor, potential vendor, or potential contractor in response to a request for a bid, proposal, or qualification is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if the vendor, contractor, potential vendor, or potential contractor that the information relates to demonstrates based on specific factual evidence that disclosure of the information would:

(1) reveal an individual approach to:

(A) work;

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

(B) organizational structure;

(C) staffing;

(D) internal operations;

(E) processes; or

(F) discounts, pricing methodology, pricing per kilowatt hour, cost data, or other pricing information that will be used in future solicitation or bid documents; and

(2) give advantage to a competitor.

Id. § 552.1101(a). Imagine also asserts some of its remaining information at issue is subject to section 552.1101. However, we find Imagine failed to provide the specific factual evidence necessary to withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.1101(a), and district may not withhold it on that basis.

Imagine also raises section 552.101 of the Government Code for some of its remaining information. However, Imagine has not pointed to any confidentiality provision, nor are we aware of any, that would make any of the submitted information confidential for purposes of section 552.101. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy), 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality). Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining materials 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 must withhold all public citizens' dates of birth under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The district must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code; however, to the extent the customer information is made available to the public by Imagine, including but not limited to on its websites or social media accounts, it may not be withheld under 552.110 of the Government Code. The district 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,

Erin Groff
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EMG/mo

Ref: ID# 939348

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

10 Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)