



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 15, 2022

Ms. Erika Orr
Public Information and Records Analyst
Dallas Independent School District
9400 North Central Expressway
Dallas, Texas 75231

OR2022-35625

Dear Ms. Orr:

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# 984964 (Ref. No. R022199-082322).

The Dallas Independent School District (the "district") received a request for certain information pertaining to a specified request for proposals. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code. Additionally, you state release of the information at issue may implicate the proprietary interests of the following third parties: eMetric, LLC ("eMetric"); GoGuardian; Instructure; PowerSchool; and SmartFolks, Inc. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation demonstrating, the district notified these interested 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(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 eMetric. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.¹

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 the requestor is a representative of Focus School Software ("Focus"), and the submitted information includes Focus's proposal. As we assume the requestor does not seek access to Focus's own proposal, we do not address the public availability of that information.

received comments from any of the remaining third parties explaining why the information at issue should not be released. Thus, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining third parties have a protected proprietary interest in the information at issue. *See, e.g., id.* § 552.110 (requiring the provision of specific factual evidence demonstrating the applicability of the exception). Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the remaining third parties may have in it.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code excepts 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. Therefore, we conclude the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.

Next, we address eMetric’s argument against disclosure of some of its information under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110(b) states, “[e]xcept as provided by [s]ection 552.0222, information is [excepted from required disclosure] if it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that the information is a trade secret.” 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 states:

Except as provided by Section 552.0222, 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 is [excepted from required disclosure].

Id. § 552.110(c). Additionally, we note section 552.0222(b) lists certain types of information to which section 552.110 does not apply. *See id.* § 552.0222(b). Upon review, we find eMetric has demonstrated portions of its information at issue constitute commercial

or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code.² However, we find some of the remaining information at issue is subject to section 552.0222(b) and may not be withheld on the basis of section 552.110 of the Government Code. Additionally, we find eMetric has failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating any portion of the rest of the remaining information at issue is a trade secret or constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would result in substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.”³ *Id.* § 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 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.). Accordingly, the district must withhold all dates of birth within the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code 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 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 the information we have marked under section 552.110(c) of the Government Code. The district must withhold all dates of birth within the remaining information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The district must release the remaining information; however, any information subject to copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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

³ 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).

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,

Blake Brennan
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

BBX/pt

Ref: ID# 984964

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

c: Third Parties
(w/o enclosures)