



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL  
GREG ABBOTT

August 4, 2003

Mr. Jesus Toscano, Jr.  
Administrative Assistant City Attorney  
City of Dallas  
1500 Marilla Street, Rm 7DN  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2003-5399

Dear Mr. Toscano:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 185292.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for sixteen categories of information related to Gila Corporation, d/b/a Municipal Services Bureau ("MSB") and other documents related to the award of a court fines and fees contract with the city. You state that most of the requested information will be released to the requestor. However, you claim that a portion of the requested information may be excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 through 552.137 of the Government Code. You make no arguments and take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under any of those exceptions. You have notified MSB, a third party whose proprietary interests may be implicated, of the request for information pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Chapter 552 of Government Code in certain circumstances). The city has submitted the information at issue to this office.<sup>1</sup> We also received correspondence from MSB. We have considered its arguments and have reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup>We note that MSB seeks to withhold portions of the information it has submitted to this office. However, this ruling does not address this information, and is limited to the information submitted as responsive by the city. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested, or representative sample if voluminous amount of information was requested).

Initially, we note that MSB has identified portions of its information as proprietary and confidential. However, information is not confidential under the Public Information Act (the "Act") simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract."). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any agreement specifying otherwise.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." This section encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. For information to be protected from public disclosure under common-law privacy, the information must meet the criteria set out in *Industrial Foundation v. Texas Industrial Accident Board*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). Information must be withheld from the public when (1) it is highly intimate and embarrassing such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, and (2) there is no legitimate public interest in its disclosure. *Id.* at 685; Open Records Decision No. 611 at 1 (1992). This office has found that personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is protected by common-law privacy, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 373 (1983) (common-law privacy protects assets and income source information). Having reviewed the submitted information, we find that it does contain financial information concerning certain individuals. However, even if this information is considered highly intimate and embarrassing, we conclude that there is a legitimate public interest in this information. Further, the remaining financial information concerns a company rather than an individual and is not protected by common-law privacy. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); *see also United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950) (corporation has no right to privacy). Therefore, none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code and common-law privacy.

MSB also asserts section 552.110 of the Government Code in regard to portions of its information. This section 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). Section 552.110(a) protects the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure

trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a). A "trade secret"

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It differs from other secret information in a business in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees. . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 2 (1990), 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others involved in [the company's] business;
- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 (1982), 306 (1982), 255 (1980), 232 (1979). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is exempted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

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. Gov’t Code § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

After reviewing the correspondence submitted by MSB, we agree that some of the information MSB has identified consists of trade secret information and commercial or financial information. MSB has established a *prima facie* case for the exemption of trade secret information, and this office received no arguments that rebut the claims of MSB as a matter of law. Furthermore, MSB has demonstrated by assertion of specific factual evidence that the release of the identified commercial or financial information would cause substantial competitive harm. However, we do not find that MSB has demonstrated how the remainder of its information is a trade secret or commercial or financial information the release of which would cause MSB substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 509 at 5 (1988) (stating that 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 was entirely too speculative). Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

Additionally, section 552.136 of the Government Code makes certain account number information confidential and provides in relevant part:

- (a) In this section, “access device” means a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to:

---

<sup>2</sup>As section 552.110 of the Government Code is dispositive of the information entitled “Supporting Technical Documents for: City of Dallas,” we need not address MSB’s argument under section 552.136 of the Government Code for this information.

- (1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value; or
- (2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.

Accordingly, the city must withhold the account number we have marked pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code.

Finally, the submitted information contains an e-mail address of a member of the public that may be excepted from disclosure. Section 552.137 of the Government Code makes certain e-mail addresses confidential and provides in relevant part:

(a) An e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body is confidential and not subject to disclosure under this chapter.

(b) Confidential information described by this section that relates to a member of the public may be disclosed if the member of the public affirmatively consents to its release.

Section 552.137 does not apply to a business's general e-mail address or website address. Accordingly, unless consent to release has been granted, the city must withhold the submitted e-mail address under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

In summary, we conclude that the city must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.110, 552.136, and 552.137 of the Government Code. All remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the

governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



W. Montgomery Meitler  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

WMM/lmt

Ref: ID# 185292

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Thomas S. Goggan, III  
Linebarger, Goggan, Blair & Sampson, L.L.P.  
P.O. Box 17428  
Austin, Texas 78760  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Richard L. Butler  
Vice President  
Municipal Services Bureau  
5912 Balcones Drive  
Austin, Texas 78731  
(w/enclosures)