



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

September 18, 2006

Ms. Therese Sternenberg  
Public Information Coordinator  
Texas Guaranteed Student Loan Corporation  
P.O. Box 83100  
Round Rock, Texas 78683-3100

OR2006-10799

Dear Ms. Sternenberg:

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# 259638.

The Texas Guaranteed Student Loan Corporation (the "corporation") received three requests for information pertaining to the corporation's insurance information and that of its third party vendor, Hummingbird, Ltd. ("Hummingbird"), and multiple categories of information pertaining to a specified incident of data loss and the corporation's investigation of the data loss. You state that the corporation has released some information to one requestor. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.103, 552.107, 552.108, and 552.139 of the Government Code. You also contend that portions of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of third party Hummingbird. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified Hummingbird of the requests for information and of Hummingbird's right to submit arguments to this office as to why its information should not be released. *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 in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Hummingbird. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information, portions of which you state are representative samples.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, we note that some of the submitted information was created after the request for that information was received. Because this information was created after the corporation's receipt of the request, it is not encompassed by the request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986) (governmental body not required to disclose information that did not exist at the time request was received). Accordingly, we do not address the availability of this non-responsive information, and the corporation need not release it in response to the request.

Next, we note that the submitted information contains contracts that are subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code. Section 552.022 provides, in pertinent part, as follows:

(a) Without limiting the amount or kind of information that is public information under this chapter, the following categories of information are public information and not excepted from required disclosure under this chapter unless they are expressly confidential under other law:

...

(3) information in an account, voucher, or contract relating to the receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by a governmental body[.]

Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3). The contracts we have marked relate to the expenditure of public funds by the corporation and are subject to section 552.022(a)(3). Therefore, as prescribed by section 552.022, the corporation must release this information unless it is confidential under other law. You argue that this information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.103 of the Government Code. However, section 552.103 is a discretionary exception under the Act and does not constitute "other law" for purposes of section 552.022. *See 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); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions generally). Accordingly,

---

<sup>1</sup>We assume that the "representative samples" of records submitted to this office are 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.

the corporation may not withhold this information under section 552.103 of the Government Code. Hummingbird, however, raises section 552.110 of the Government Code for portions of the information subject to section 552.022. Because section 552.110 is considered other law for purposes of section 552.022, we will address Hummingbird's arguments for this information.

Hummingbird asserts that its pricing information and the identity of its sub-contractor are protected under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 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 exempted 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. *Id.*; *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 Hummingbird’s arguments and the submitted information, we find that Hummingbird has not presented a *prima facie* claim that any portion of the information at issue qualifies as a trade secret under section 552.110(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990); *see also* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). We therefore determine that no portion of the information subject to section 552.022 is exempted from disclosure under section 552.110(a).

We also find that Hummingbird has not sufficiently shown that the release of any portion of the information subject to section 552.022 would be likely to cause the company substantial competitive harm 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, experience,

and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). Furthermore, we note that 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 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). We therefore conclude that none of the information subject to section 552.022 is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b).

We now consider the corporation's arguments for the remaining submitted information. Section 552.103 of the Government Code provides in relevant part 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 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). A governmental body has the burden of providing relevant facts and documents to show that the section 552.103 exception is applicable in a particular situation. The test for meeting this burden is a showing that (1) litigation was pending or reasonably anticipated on the date that the governmental body received the request for information, 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). A governmental body must meet both prongs of this test for information to be excepted under section 552.103.

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. *See 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 555 (1990); *see also* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 361 (1983).

You explain that the incident of data loss affects approximately 1.75 million student borrowers. You state that in response to data loss notices sent to these affected borrowers, the corporation has received telephone calls, electronic mail messages, and letters indicating that individuals affected by the data loss are pursuing and threatening litigation against the corporation. You also provide documentation from borrowers, some of which were sent from the affected borrower's retained legal counsel, threatening to sue the corporation as a result of the data loss. Based on your arguments and our review of the information at issue, we find that the corporation reasonably anticipated litigation on the date it received the requests for information and that this information is related to that anticipated litigation. Thus, section 552.103 is applicable, and the submitted information that is not subject to section 552.022 may be withheld on this basis.

Generally, however, once information has been obtained by all parties to the litigation through discovery or otherwise, no section 552.103(a) interest exists with respect to that information. Open Records Decision Nos. 349 (1982), 320 (1982). Thus, responsive information to which the opposing parties in the litigation have had access is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.103(a), and it must be disclosed. Further, the applicability of section 552.103(a) ends once the litigation has concluded. Attorney General Opinion MW-575 (1982); Open Records Decision No. 350 (1982).

In summary, the corporation must release the information we have marked under section 552.022(a)(3) of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information may be withheld under section 552.103 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup>

You also ask this office to issue a previous determination that would permit the corporation to withhold in the future any information relating to the data loss incident under section 552.103 of the Government Code. We decline to issue such a previous determination at this time. Accordingly, 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

---

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining submitted arguments against disclosure.

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,



Lisa V. Cubriel  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LVC/eb

LVC/eb

Ref: ID# 259638

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Charles W. Schwartz  
Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher & Flom, L.L.P.  
1000 Louisiana, Suite 6800  
Houston, Texas 77002-5026  
(w/o enclosures)