



**ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS**  
**GREG ABBOTT**

May 12, 2004

Ms. R. Yvette Clark  
General Counsel  
Stephen F. Austin State University  
P.O. Box 13065, SFA Station  
Nacogdoches, Texas 75962-3065

OR2004-3877

Dear Ms. Clark:

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# 201138.

Stephen F. Austin State University (the "university") received a request for "the winning bid along with all the other bids placed for this year's bid proposal" related to a commencement photography contract. You indicate that release of the requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you provide documentation showing that you notified the interested parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information should not be released.<sup>1</sup> See Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); 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 the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

---

<sup>1</sup>The third parties that were notified pursuant to section 552.305 are the following: Chappell Graduation Image ("Chappell"); Flash Photography, Inc. ("Flash"); Candid Campus Photography ("Candid"), and CSI.

We note that 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 requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Candid and CSI have not submitted any comments to this office explaining how release of the requested information would affect their proprietary interests. Therefore, Candid and CSI have provided us with no basis to conclude that they have protected proprietary interests in any of the submitted information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 639 at 4 (1996), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990).

We note, however, that Chappell and Flash have each submitted comments contending that information in their proposals is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 of the Government Code 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. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 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 No. 232 (1979). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted 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); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

Upon review of the submitted information and the arguments submitted by Flash, we find that Flash has made a *prima facie* case that the portions of its proposal that Flash seeks to withhold are protected as trade secrets. Moreover, we have received no arguments that would rebut these claims as a matter of law. Thus, we have marked the portions of the information at issue in the proposal of Flash that the university must withhold pursuant to section 552.110(a).

We find that Chappell has made specific factual or evidentiary showings that the release of some of the information it seeks to withhold would cause the company substantial competitive harm. This information, which we have marked, must be withheld pursuant to section 552.110(b). We find, however, that this company has not shown that any of the remaining information it seeks to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret or that its release would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the remaining information pertaining to this company may not be withheld pursuant to section 552.110.

Lastly, we note that some of the submitted information that is not excepted from disclosure is protected by copyright. A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception to disclosure applies to the information. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). An officer for public information must comply with the copyright law, however, and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, he or she 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 at 8-9 (1990).

Accordingly, we have marked the information that the university must withhold under section 552.110. The remaining information must be released to the requestor. In releasing information that is protected by copyright, the university must comply with copyright law.

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,



Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/jh

Ref: ID# 201138  
Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Chase Fountain  
Southern Exposure  
326 North LBJ  
San Marcos, Texas 78666  
(w/o enclosures)

c: Mr. Lewis H. Denbaum  
General Counsel  
Chappell  
P.O. Box 1029  
Fairfield, Iowa 52556  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Katie Anderson  
Strasburger & Price, L.L.P.  
901 Main Street, Suite 4300  
Dallas, Texas 75202-3794  
Attorney for Flash Photography, Inc.  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Steven Montgomery  
CSI  
1700 Bay Street  
Charlotte, North Carolina 28204  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Joseph Fasullo, Jr.  
Candid Campus Photography  
1406 Franklen Street  
Gretna, Louisiana 70053  
(w/o enclosures)