



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

February 18, 2005

Ms. Rosalinda Garcia  
Sr. Assistant County Attorney  
Harris County  
2525 Holly Hall, Suite 190  
Houston, TX 77054

OR2005-01514

Dear Ms. Garcia:

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# 219006.

The Harris County Purchasing Agent (the "county") received a request for information regarding contracts between the Harris County Hospital District and Bayer HealthCare LLC ("Bayer") and Dade Bering, Inc. ("Dade") for chemistry analyzers, reagents, and related products. Specifically, the requestor seeks "the cost per test pricing from the successful bidders not all the [responses]." You make no arguments against release of the requested information, but instead you indicate that you have relied on the relevant third parties to submit briefs. *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 Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Act in certain circumstances). You have notified Bayer and Dade of the request for information. They submitted comments to you, which you have forwarded to our office. We have reviewed the submitted information and considered the arguments of Bayer and Dade.

Initially, we note that, although the county has submitted certain contracts to our office as responsive to the request, the requestor seeks only certain specific pricing information from such contracts. Thus, we find that the remaining parts of the contracts submitted to this office are not responsive and need not be released to the requestor.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>In this regard, we note that, in correspondence between the county and the requestor submitted by the county to this office, the county informed the requestor that "if you require more information [than] what I provided in the executed contract (minus pricing), you will need to send me a written request for each project, stating exactly what it is you want to see."

We next address Dade's argument that the information at issue contains information that is subject to confidentiality agreements Dade has with other entities and is therefore confidential under the Act. However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. 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. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 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.”); 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 falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any agreement specifying otherwise.

We also understand Bayer and Dade to contend that the pricing information is confidential under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties 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). Under section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, 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) (emphasis added); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

The following six factors are relevant to the determination of whether information qualifies as a trade secret under section 757 of the Restatement of Torts:

- (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 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 must accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990).

Section 552.110(b) of the Government Code exempts 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). 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* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm); *see also Nat’l Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

Bayer objects to the release of pricing associated with its contracts because it considers this information proprietary. Dade objects to the release of its pricing information because to “disclose individual . . . pricing to a competitor would provide that competitor with a real and significant advantage in understanding [Dade’s] pricing structure and ‘go to market strategy.’” After reviewing the arguments and the submitted pricing information, we conclude that Bayer and Dade have failed to establish a *prima facie* case for the trade secret exception under section 552.110(a). Additionally, we find that Dade and Bayer have made only conclusory allegations that release of the information at issue would cause them substantial competitive injury and have provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations for purposes of section 552.110(b). *See* 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 speculative), 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor); *see also* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939) (information is generally not trade secret if it is “simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business” rather than “a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business”). Additionally, we note that the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). *See generally* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Moreover, we believe the public has a strong interest in the release of prices in government contract awards. *See* Open Records Decision No. 494 (1988) (requiring balancing of public interest in disclosure with competitive injury to company). Thus, none of the information at issue may be withheld pursuant to section 552.110, and the county must release it.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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); *Tex. 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,



Elizabeth A. Stephens  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

EAS/krl

Ref: ID#219006

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Cindy Preble  
Beckman Coulter, Inc.  
1111 Old Eagle School Road  
Wayne, PA 19087  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Louise S. Pearson  
General Counsel  
Dade Behring, Inc.  
P. O. Box 778  
Deerfield, IL 60015-0778  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Kim Brath  
Account Manager  
Bayer HealthCare LLC, Diagnostics Division  
115 Norwood Park South  
Norwood, MA 02062  
(w/o enclosures)