



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

August 22, 2022

Ms. Tessa K. Meredith  
Counsel for the City of Murphy  
Messer, Fort, & McDonald, P.L.L.C.  
6371 Preston Road, Suite 200  
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2022-25060

Dear Ms. Meredith:

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# 965156 (ORR# W005570 & W005598).

The City of Murphy (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from the same requestor for bid tabulations for a specified project. You claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code. You also state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of A&B Construction, LLC; Douglas Dailey Construction, LLC; Excel 4 Construction, LLC; and Murphy Pipeline Contractors, LLC ("MPC"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these 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(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 MPC. We have reviewed the submitted information and considered the submitted arguments.

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) 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 of the remaining third parties have protected proprietary interests 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 city may not withhold the submitted

information on the basis of any proprietary interest any of the remaining third parties may have in the information.

The city and MPC raise section 552.104 of the Government Code for a portion of its information. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure information “if a governmental body demonstrates that release of the information would harm its interests by providing an advantage to a competitor or bidder in a particular ongoing competitive situation or in a particular competitive situation where the governmental body establishes the situation at issue is set to reoccur or there is a specific and demonstrable intent to enter into the competitive situation again in the future.” *Id.* § 552.104(a) (emphasis added). In *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015), the Texas Supreme Court held section 552.104 does not preclude third parties from raising section 552.104 as an exception to disclosure. *See Boeing*, 466 S.W.3d at 842. However, the Eighty-sixth Legislature has amended section 552.104 since the issuance of *Boeing*. *See* Act of May 25, 2019, 86th Leg., R.S., S.B. 943, § 3. Section 552.104 now expressly limits the protections of section 552.104 to governmental bodies. Gov’t Code § 552.104(a). Therefore, we do not address MPC’s arguments under section 552.104. 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*, 466 S.W.3d at 841. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find the city has established the release of the information at issue would harm its interests by providing an advantage to a competitor or bidder in a particular ongoing competitive situation. Thus, we conclude the city may withhold the information it marked under section 552.104(a).<sup>1</sup> The city must release the remaining information.

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,

Colin Henry  
Attorney  
Open Records Division

CEH/jm

---

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

Ref: ID# 965156

c: Requestor

4 Third Parties