



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

May 23, 2016

Ms. Katherine R. Fite  
Assistant General Counsel  
Texas Department of Information Resources  
P.O. Box 13564  
Austin, Texas 78711-3564

OR2016-11753

Dear Ms. Fite:

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# 611236.

The Texas Department of Information Resources (the "department") received a request for all documentation submitted by two named companies in response to a specified statement of work. You state you have released some information. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. You also state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Gartner, Inc. ("Gartner"), and IDC Research, Inc. ("IDC"). Accordingly, you state you notified Gartner and IDC of the request for information and of their 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 comments from Gartner and IDC. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

The department argues the submitted information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which protects (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information, the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b). We note,

however, that exception is designed to protect the interests of third parties, not the interests of a governmental body. Thus, we do not address the department's argument under section 552.110.

Gartner asserts portions of the submitted information are protected by sections 552(b)(4) and 552(b)(6) of title 5 of the United States Code, the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA"). We note FOIA is applicable to information held by an agency of the federal government. In this instance, the information at issue is held by a Texas agency, which is subject to the laws of the State of Texas. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-95 (1979) (FOIA exceptions apply to federal agencies, not to state agencies); Open Records Decision Nos. 496 (1988), 124 (1976); *see also Davidson v. Georgia*, 622 F.2d 895, 897 (5th Cir. 1980) (state governments are not subject to FOIA); Open Records Decision No. 561 at 7 n.3 (1990) (noting federal authorities may apply confidentiality principles found in FOIA differently from way in which such principles are applied under Texas open records law). This office has stated in numerous opinions that information in the possession of a governmental body of the State of Texas is not confidential or excepted from disclosure merely because the same information is or would be confidential in the hands of a federal agency. *See, e.g.,* Attorney General Opinion MW-95 (neither FOIA nor federal Privacy Act of 1974 applies to records held by state or local governmental bodies in Texas); ORD 124 (fact that information held by federal agency is excepted by FOIA does not necessarily mean that same information is excepted under Act when held by Texas governmental body). Thus, the department may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of FOIA.

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). 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. IDC states it has competitors. In addition, IDC states release of its information would "compromise [its] competitive position" in future bids. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find IDC has established the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the department may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.104(a).

Gartner also claims portions of its information are subject to section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Section 552.110(b) protects "[c]ommercial 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[.]" Gov't Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial

information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm).

Upon review, we find Gartner has demonstrated its customer information constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury to Gartner. Accordingly, the department must withhold Gartner's customer information, to the extent the information is not publicly available on the company's website, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find Gartner has not demonstrated release of any of its remaining information would result in substantial harm to its competitive position. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 509 at 5 (1988) (because costs, bid specifications, and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts is too speculative), 319 at 3 (1989) (statutory predecessor to section 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing). Furthermore, we note the pricing information of a winning bidder, such as Gartner, is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). *See generally* Dep't of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-45 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Therefore, the department may not withhold any of Gartner's remaining information under section 552.110(b).

We note some of the remaining information appears to be subject to copyright law. 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 department may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code. The department must withhold Gartner's customer information, to the extent the information is not publicly available on the company's website, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released; however, any information protected by copyright may only be released 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 [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,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Cole Hutchison". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "C" and a long horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Cole Hutchison  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CH/akg

Ref: ID# 611236

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

2 Third Parties  
(w/o enclosures)