



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

March 16, 2016

Ms. Cynthia Tynan  
Attorney & Public Information Coordinator  
Office of General Counsel  
The University of Texas System  
201 West Seventh Street  
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2016-06121

Dear Ms. Tynan:

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# 601748 (OGC# 166712).

The University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio (the "university") received a request for all temporary employment services contracts that will be succeeded by a specified request for proposals and the amount spent on such contracts during a specified time period. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of InGenesis, Inc. ("InGenesis"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified InGenesis of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue 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 arguments from InGenesis.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup>InGenesis has no objection to the release of its invoice spreadsheets.

InGenesis asserts the information it marked is protected under section 552.104 of the Government Code. 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). In considering whether a private third party may assert this exception, the supreme court reasoned because section 552.305(a) of the Government Code includes section 552.104 as an example of an exception that involves a third party’s property interest, 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. InGenesis states it has competitors. In addition, InGenesis states the information at issue, if released, would give the requestor an advantage in submitting a competitive bid to the same request for proposals and seeks to withhold the terms of the contract. For many years, this office concluded the terms of a contract and especially the pricing of a winning bidder are public and generally not excepted from disclosure. Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency), 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors), 494 (1988) (requiring balancing of public interest in disclosure with competitive injury to company). *See generally* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). However, now, pursuant to *Boeing*, section 552.104 is not limited to only ongoing competitive situations, and a third party need only show release of its competitively sensitive information would give an advantage to a competitor even after a contract is executed. *Boeing*, 466 S.W.3d 831, at 831, 839. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find InGenesis has established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the university may withhold the information at issue under section 552.104(a).<sup>2</sup>

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.”<sup>3</sup> 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

---

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

<sup>3</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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 personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally highly intimate or embarrassing. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (employee's designation of retirement beneficiary, choice of insurance carrier, election of optional coverages, direct deposit authorization, forms allowing employee to allocate pretax compensation to group insurance, health care or dependent care), 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). Upon review, we find the employee salary information in the submitted invoices satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the university must withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the university may withhold the information InGenesis marked under section 552.104 of the Government Code. The university must also withhold the employee salary information in InGenesis's submitted invoices under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The university 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 [http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Ashley Crutchfield  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

AC/dls

Ref: ID# 601748

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brian Crush  
General Manager  
InGenesis, Inc.  
10231 Kotzebue Street  
San Antonio, Texas 78217  
(w/o enclosures)