



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

December 11, 2006

Mr. W. Lee Auvenshine  
Assistant Ellis County & District Attorney  
Temporary Administration Building  
1201 North Highway 77, Suite 104  
Waxahachie, Texas 75165-7832

OR2006-14504

Dear Mr. Auvenshine:

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# 266493.

The Ellis County Purchasing Director (the "county") received a request for "the winning proposal and current jail food services contract." Although you raise no exceptions to disclosure on behalf of the county, you state, and provide documentation showing, that you have notified *Correctional Food Services, L.P.* ("CFS"), 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 information.

Initially, we note that you did not submit information responsive to the request for the "current jail food services contract." We assume the county has released this contract to the requestor. If it has not, it must do so at this time to the extent that such contract exists. *See Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible under circumstances); see also Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3) (information in account, voucher, or contract relating to receipt or expenditure of public or other funds by governmental body is not excepted from required disclosure unless made expressly confidential by law).*

CFS asserts that its bid proposal was submitted as confidential, with the expectation that the proposal would remain confidential. We note, however, that information that is subject to disclosure under the Act is not confidential simply because the parties submitting the information anticipate or request that it be kept confidential. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, governmental bodies or third-parties cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from public disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the common law right of privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, and (2) of no legitimate public interest. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The common law right to privacy encompasses some types of personal financial information. This office has determined that financial information that relates only to an individual ordinarily satisfies the first element of the common law privacy test, but the public has a legitimate interest in the essential facts about a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9-12 (1992) (identifying public and private portions of certain state personnel records), 545 at 4 (1990) (attorney general has found kinds of financial information not excepted from public disclosure by common law privacy to generally be those regarding receipt of governmental funds or debts owed to governmental entities), 523 at 4 (1989) (noting distinction under common law privacy between confidential background financial information furnished to public body about individual and basic facts regarding particular financial transaction between individual and public body), 373 at 4 (1983) (determination of whether public’s interest in obtaining personal financial information is sufficient to justify its disclosure must be made on case-by-case basis). We note, however, that common law privacy protects the interests of individuals, not those of corporations or other types of business organizations. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); *see also U. S. v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950); *Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989), *rev’d on other grounds*, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990) (corporation has no right to privacy). Upon review, we find that the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the common law right to privacy. The remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.101 on that basis.

We understand CFS to contend that portions of its information are excepted from disclosure 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: (a) trade

secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision; and (b) 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. Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b).

Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. Gov't Code § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). Section 757 provides that a trade secret is

any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives him 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 . . . . 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). 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 excepted 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. Gov’t Code § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

In this instance, we find that CFS has not demonstrated how any of its information meets the definition of a trade secret. *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). Accordingly, the information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.110(a).

We find CFS has established that the release of some of the information at issue would cause it substantial competitive injury; therefore, the county must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b). We find, however, that CFS has failed to demonstrate that any other portion of the information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. *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 3 (1982) (information relating to organization, personnel, and qualifications not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Accordingly, pursuant to section 552.110, the county must withhold only those portions of the information at issue that we have marked.

The remaining information contains insurance policy numbers subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136 states that “[n]otwithstanding 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 county must therefore withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136.

We note that the submitted information contains social security numbers. Section 552.147 of the Government Code provides that “[t]he social security number of a living person is excepted from” required public disclosure under the Act. Therefore, the county must withhold the social security numbers contained in the submitted information under section 552.147.<sup>1</sup>

In summary, the county must withhold 1) the personal financial information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common law privacy, 2) the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code, 3) the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code, and 4) the marked social security numbers under section 552.147 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

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).

---

<sup>1</sup>We note that section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person’s social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office under the Act.

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/eb

Ref: ID# 266493

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Adrienne O'Keefe  
Bates Investigations, Inc.  
4131 Spicewood Springs Road #J2  
Austin, Texas 78759  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Larry Hanson  
Correctional Food Services, L.P.  
6319 McCommas Boulevard  
Dallas, Texas 75214  
(w/o enclosures)