



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 3, 2022

Mr. James E. Byrom
Counsel for the San Jacinto Community College District
Thompson & Horton LLP
3200 Southwest Freeway, Suite 2000
Houston, Texas 77027-7554

OR2022-34279

Dear Mr. Byrom:

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# 979087.

The San Jacinto Community College District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for evaluation materials and bid submissions related to a specified request for proposals. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.104 and 552.136 of the Government Code. In addition, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Cirrus Interpreting; Homeland Language Services; Linguabee, LLC ("Linguabee"); Universe Technical Translation, Inc.; and Visual Communication Services. 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 Linguabee.¹ 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) 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

¹ We note, although we have received comments from Linguabee, Linguabee claims no exceptions and makes no arguments against disclosure of the information at issue.

received comments from 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, and the district may not withhold any portion of it on that basis. *See, e.g., id.* § 552.110 (requiring the provision of specific factual evidence demonstrating the applicability of the exception).

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code exempts from disclosure information that a governmental body demonstrates, if released, 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). 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 Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831, 841 (Tex. 2015). After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find you have failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 552.104 to the information at issue. Thus, we conclude the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a government body is confidential.” Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device number for purposes of this exception. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 at 9 (2009). Accordingly, the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. However, upon review, we find you have failed to demonstrate the remaining information at issue consists of access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.”² Gov’t Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). 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 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 the public citizen’s date of birth in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

² The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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 district must: (1) withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code; (2) withhold the public citizen's date of birth in the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy; and (3) 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,

Tim Neal
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

TN/pt

Ref: ID# 979087

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)