



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 4, 2006

Ms. Valerie Coleman-Ferguson  
Senior Assistant General Counsel  
Office of the General Counsel  
University of Houston System  
311 East Cullen Building  
Houston, Texas 77204-2028

OR2006-14187

Dear Ms. Coleman-Ferguson:

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# 265963.

The University of Houston (the "university") received a request for eight categories of information pertaining to Patent No. 7,056,866 or  $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_7$ . You state that some of the requested information has been released to the requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.104, and 552.107 of the Government Code. You also claim that the requested information may contain the proprietary information of a third party. Although you take no position on the proprietary nature of the information, you state, and provide documentation showing, that you have notified Metal Oxide Technologies, Inc. ("MOT") of the request and of its opportunity to submit comments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestor. *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 the applicability of exception to disclose under Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>We assume that the representative sample of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

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 information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this decision, MOT has not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, MOT has provided us with no basis to conclude that it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See, e.g., id.* § 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. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, we conclude that the university may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest MOT may have in the information.

We next note that some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022(a)(3) provides for the required public disclosure of "information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body." *Id.* § 552.022(a)(3). Thus, the university must release the submitted license agreement and check under section 552.022, unless they contain information that is expressly confidential under other law or is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. We have marked the submitted information that is subject to section 552.022. We note that the university does not raise section 552.108.

Although you seek to withhold the information subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103 of the Government Code, that section is a discretionary exception to disclosure that protects a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See id.* § 552.007; *Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). As such, section 552.103 is not other law that makes information confidential for the purposes of section 552.022. Therefore, the university may not withhold any of the information that is subject to section 552.022 under section 552.103. We will, however, address your claim under section 552.104 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> We also note that some of the information at issue is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code, which constitutes other law for purposes of section 552.022.<sup>3</sup> We will therefore address this exception as well.

---

<sup>2</sup>Section 552.104(b) provides that "[t]he requirement of Section 552.022 that a category of information listed under Section 552.022(a) is public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless expressly confidential under law does not apply to information that is excepted from required disclosure under this section." Gov't Code § 552.104(b).

<sup>3</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.136 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Section 552.104 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104(a). The purpose of section 552.104 is to protect a governmental body’s interests in competitive bidding situations. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). Section 552.104 requires a showing of some actual or specific harm in a particular competitive situation; a general allegation that a competitor will gain an unfair advantage will not suffice. *See* Open Records Decision No. 541 at 4 (1990). Section 552.104 does not protect information relating to competitive bidding situations once a contract has been awarded and is in effect. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 306 (1982), 184 (1978).

In this instance, the information at issue consists of a license agreement between the university and a private entity. Normally, section 552.104 does not protect information relating to competitive bidding situations once a contract has been awarded. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 306 (1982), 184 (1978). Nevertheless, you argue that the release of the information at issue could impact future negotiations with other companies that enter into agreements with the university. We disagree, finding that the assertion that the release of the past contracts might give a bidder an unfair advantage on future contracts is entirely too speculative. *See* Open Records Decision No. 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 to withhold information under predecessor statute). Therefore, we conclude that you have not demonstrated that public release of the information at issue would cause specific harm to the university’s interests in a competitive bidding situation. Accordingly, the university may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code 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 university must withhold the information that we have marked pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code in the check subject to section 552.022.

With respect to the submitted information that is not subject to section 552.022, we address your claims under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Section 552.103 provides as follows:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if it is information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person's office or employment, is or may be a party.

...

(c) Information relating to litigation involving a governmental body or an officer or employee of a governmental body is excepted from disclosure under Subsection (a) only if the litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the requestor applies to the officer for public information for access to or duplication of the information.

Gov't Code § 552.103(a), (c). The governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103(a) exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation is pending or reasonably anticipated, and (2) the information at issue is related to that litigation. *Univ. of Tex. Law Sch. v. Tex. Legal Found.*, 958 S.W.2d 479, 481 (Tex. App.—Austin 1997, no pet.); *Heard v. Houston Post Co.*, 684 S.W.2d 210, 212 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.); Open Records Decision No. 551 at 4 (1990). The governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103(a).

To establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated, a governmental body must provide this office "concrete evidence showing that the claim that litigation may ensue is more than mere conjecture." Open Records Decision No. 452 at 4 (1986). Whether litigation is reasonably anticipated must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *Id.* Concrete evidence to support a claim that litigation is reasonably anticipated may include, for example, the governmental body's receipt of a letter containing a specific threat to sue the governmental body from an attorney for a potential opposing party. Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see* Open Records Decision No. 518 at 5 (1989) (litigation must be "realistically contemplated"). On the other hand, this office has determined that if an individual publicly threatens to bring suit against a governmental body, but does not actually take objective steps toward filing suit, litigation is not reasonably anticipated. *See* Open Records Decision No. 331 (1982). Further, the fact that a potential opposing party has hired an attorney who makes a request for information does not establish that litigation is reasonably anticipated. Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You state, and provide documentation showing, that the requestor has informed the university that he will protect the rights of his client through litigation. The requestor's client

claims to be co-inventor of the patent at issue. Based upon your representations, our review of the submitted information, and the totality of the circumstances, we conclude that the university reasonably anticipated litigation on the date that it received this request for information. We also find that the submitted information relates to the anticipated litigation. Accordingly, we conclude that the university may withhold the remaining submitted information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup>

However, once the information at issue has been obtained by all parties to the anticipated litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to the information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, any submitted information that has either been obtained from or provided to all other parties in the anticipated litigation is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a) and must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has concluded or is no longer anticipated. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, the university must release the information that is subject to section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code, except for the information we have marked that must be withheld under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The university may withhold the remaining information under section 552.103 of the Government Code.

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

---

<sup>4</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address your remaining arguments against disclosure.

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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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,



Jaime L. Flores  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLF/krl

Ref: ID# 265963

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Geoffrey A. Berg  
Dow, Golub, Berg & Beverly, LLP  
Attorneys at Law  
8 Greenway Plaza, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Houston, Texas 77046  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Louis D. Castellani  
Metal Oxide Technologies, Inc.  
8807 Emmott Road, Suite 100  
Houston, Texas 77004  
(w/o enclosures)