



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 19, 2006

Mr. David Galbraith
Assistant General Counsel
Houston Independent School District
3830 Richmond Avenue
Houston, Texas 77027-5838

OR2006-03934

Dear Mr. Galbraith:

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# 247029.

The Houston Independent School District (the "district") received a request for information pertaining to a request for proposals, project number 05-05-18. The requestor subsequently limited the request to information related to three third parties: PCS Revenue Control System ("PCS"); Cybersoft Technologies, Inc. ("Cybersoft"); and School-Link Technologies, Inc. ("School Link"). Although the district takes no position with regard to the release of the requested information, you state that you notified the interested third parties of the district's receipt of the request and of each company's right to submit arguments to us as to why any portion of the requested information pertaining to it 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 applicability of exception to disclosure under Act in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments submitted by Cybersoft and School Link.

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, PCS has failed to submit comments to this office explaining why that company's information should be withheld from disclosure. Thus, PCS has not demonstrated that any of its information is proprietary for purposes of the Act. *See id.* § 552.110; 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). Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest that PCS may have in the information.

Cybersoft and School Link assert that their information is excepted under section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104. We note, however, that section 552.104 only protects the interests of a governmental body and is not designed to protect the interests of third parties that submit information to a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991) (statutory predecessor to section 552.104 designed to protect interests of a governmental body in a competitive situation, and not interests of private parties submitting information to the government). As the district has not argued that the release of any portion of the information at issue would harm its interests in a particular competitive situation under section 552.104, none of it may be withheld on that basis.

Cybersoft and School Link also argue that portions of their information are excepted from required public disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. This section 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 [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 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” component of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a private party’s claim for exception as valid under that component if that party establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception, and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law.¹ *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). The private party must provide information that is sufficient to enable this office to conclude that the information at issue qualifies as a trade secret under section 552.110(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 at 3 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) 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.” 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 requested information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999).

Upon review, we find that Cybersoft and School Link have each made a *prima facie* case that portions of each company’s information 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 information that the district must withhold pursuant to section 552.110(a). We note, however, that while some of the customer information that each company seeks to withhold is protected under section 552.110(a), the remaining customer information that Cybersoft and School Link seek to withhold pertains to customers that are acting as references for each company. We find that neither Cybersoft or School Link have established that this remaining customer information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a). Further, we find that Cybersoft and School Link have not presented a *prima facie* claim that any of their remaining information qualifies as a trade secret under section 552.110(a).

We find that School Link has established that the release of its pricing information would cause the company substantial competitive injury; therefore, the district must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b). Further, we find that

¹The 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 other 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).

Cybersoft and School Link have made only conclusory allegations that release of the remaining information at issue would cause either company substantial competitive harm and have provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegation for purposes of section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (1999) (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue); 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 is too speculative; 319 at 2 (1982) (finding information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, and experience not excepted under section 552.110). We note that Cybersoft is the winning bidder, and the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors), 494 (1988) (requiring balancing of public interest in disclosure with competitive injury to company). *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). We therefore conclude that none of the remaining information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110.

Lastly, we note that portions of the submitted information not excepted from disclosure may 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 information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor; however, in releasing information that is protected by copyright, the district must comply with applicable 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, 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); *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,



Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/er

Ref: ID# 247029

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. John Tatham
Horizon Software International, L.L.C.
5835 Highway 20
Loganville, Georgia 30052
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brian Levy
PCS Revenue Control System
560 Sylvan Avenue
Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey 07632
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Raymond W. Barger
Cybersoft Technologies, Inc.
4422 FM 1960 West, Suite 300
Houston, Texas 77063-3416
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Rob Spooner
School Link Technologies
P.O. Box 2410
Santa Monica, California 90407
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Stephen L. Lacey
Olsson, Frank and Weeda, P.C.
Suite 400
1400 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-2220
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Kimberly A. Frost
Vinson & Elkins
2801 Via Fortuna, Suite 100
Austin, Texas 78746-7568
(w/o enclosures)