



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
G R E G A B B O T T

February 26, 2004

Ms. Cynthia J. Hill  
Attorney  
Texas Department of Information Resources  
P. O. Box 13564  
Austin, Texas 78711-3564

OR2004-1449

Dear Ms. Hill:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 196732.

The Department of Information Resources (the "department") received a request for information about a recent Request for Offer procurement process, including bid tabulations, copies of resulting contracts, and copies of all proposals. You state that some information has been provided to the requestor. Without taking a position with respect to the release of the remaining requested information, you state that this information may be excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.104, and 552.110 of the Government Code. You state that you have notified the affected vendors of this request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why information pertaining to each third party should not be released. *See Gov't Code § 552.305(d); see also 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 to disclosure under Public Information Act ("Act") in certain circumstances).* We have received correspondence from Sprint Corporation ("Sprint") and Cingular Wireless ("Cingular"). We have reviewed their arguments and the submitted information.

Both Sprint and Cingular assert that the requested information is explicitly labeled as "confidential and proprietary." We note, however, that information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. *See Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the statutory predecessor to chapter 552] cannot be compromised simply by its*

decision to enter into a contract”), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Consequently, unless the information at issue comes within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Sprint asserts that the requested information is excepted under section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” This exception protects the interests of governmental bodies, not the proprietary interests of a private party such as Sprint that has submitted information to a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8 (1991) (discussing statutory predecessor). Furthermore, section 552.104 is a discretionary exception to disclosure that a governmental body may waive. In this instance, the department has not raised section 552.104. Therefore, none of the submitted information may be withheld from disclosure under section 552.104.

Next, Sprint asserts that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Sprint raises section 552.101 in conjunction with *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). Because section 552.110(b) of the Government Code incorporates the holding of *National Parks*, we will address this claim under section 552.110 below.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision,” and (2) “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.” *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110(a)-(b).

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a “trade secret” from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a “trade secret” to be

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one’s business, and which gives him 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 a single or ephemeral event in the conduct of the business . . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business . . . . [It may] 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. 1958). If the governmental body takes no position on the application of the “trade secrets” aspect of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a private person’s claim for exception as valid under section 552.110(a) if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception, and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law.<sup>1</sup> *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (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) 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. *See also* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Sprint and Cingular both assert that all or portions of their information should be withheld from disclosure based on section 552.110. Having considered all of the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information, we conclude that the department must withhold portions of the information related to Cingular under subsections 552.110(a) and (b). We have marked the information accordingly. We otherwise find that Cingular has not established that any of its remaining information qualifies as a trade secret under section 552.110(a) or that release of any of this remaining information would cause Cingular substantial competitive injury as required by section 552.110(b). We also find that Sprint has made only conclusory allegations and has made no specific factual or evidentiary showing that release of any of its information would likely cause it substantial commercial harm. Therefore, none of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110. *See also* Open Records Decision Nos. 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 was entirely too

---

<sup>1</sup>The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company];
- (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 [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information;
- (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 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

speculative), 319 at 3 (1982) (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).

Finally, we note that a portion of the information related to Cingular 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. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the department must withhold the information we have marked related to Cingular under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor, in compliance with copyright law for any information protected by copyright.

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,



Sarah I. Swanson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

SIS/lmt

Ref: ID# 196732

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Pamela Gerritson  
Nextel Communications  
111 Congress Avenue, Suite 1650  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Scott W. Andreason  
Sprint  
6450 Spring Parkwya, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Overland Park, KS 66251  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Darren B. Stand  
Cingular Wireless  
17330 Preston Road, Suite 100A  
Dallas, Texas 75252  
(w/o enclosures)