



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 18, 2004

Mr. James R. Raup
McGinnis, Lochridge & Kilgore L.L.P.
1300 Capitol Center
919 Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2004-9799

Dear Mr. Raup:

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# 213163.

The Round Rock Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for information related to the district's armored transport services bid. You claim that the requested information may be excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.110 of the Government Code, but make no arguments and take no position as to whether the information is so excepted. You inform us that the district notified Dunbar Armored ("Dunbar") and Loomis Fargo and Company ("Loomis"), the third parties whose proprietary interests may be implicated by the request, of the district's receipt of the request and of each third party's right to submit arguments to us as to why any portion of the remaining requested information should not be released to the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (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 in Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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, Loomis has not submitted any

comments to this office explaining how release of the requested information would affect its proprietary interests. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information relating to Loomis is proprietary information, and none of it may be withheld on that basis. *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. 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), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990).

Dunbar states that it submitted its proposal to the district with a statement indicating that such information was to remain confidential. However, information that is subject to disclosure under the Act may not be withheld simply because the party submitting it anticipates or requests confidentiality. *See Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 676-78 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). Further, it is well-settled that a governmental body's promise to keep information confidential is not a basis for withholding that information from the public, unless the governmental body has specific authority to keep the information confidential. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 514 at 1 (1988), 476 at 1-2 (1987, 444 at 6 (1986)). Consequently, the submitted information must fall within an exception to disclosure in order to be withheld.

Dunbar claims that all financial information submitted in connection with its proposal to the district is excepted under section 552.110. This section protects the proprietary interests of private persons by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) trade secrets 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 [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 a single or ephemeral event 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 . . . [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). In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret, as well as the Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.¹ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we will accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) applies 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[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).

Having considered the submitted arguments, we find that Dunbar has neither shown that any of the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret nor demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. Thus, we are unable to conclude that section 552.110(a) applies to any of its submitted information. *See* Open Records Decision

¹ The six factors that the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret are:

(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).

No. 402 (1983). Likewise, we find that Dunbar has failed to show that substantial competitive injury would likely result from the release of any of the information in question. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 8 (1990) (general terms of contract with governmental body are usually not excepted from disclosure), 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); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (1999), 319 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor). We therefore conclude that none of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110.

We note, however, that the submitted information contains insurance policy numbers that are subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136 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:

(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.

Gov't Code § 552.136. The marked insurance policy numbers must be withheld under section 552.136.

Finally, we note that some of the submitted information 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 district must withhold the marked insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining requested information must be released in accordance with applicable copyright laws 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,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/jh

Ref: ID# 213163
Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jay Lack
Triple D Security
901 Profit Drive
Victoria, Texas 77902
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Russell E. Daniels
Dunbar Armored
P.O. Box 333
Baltimore, Maryland 21203-0333
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael A. Trevino
Loomis Fargo and Company
78 North IH 35
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)