



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

January 5, 2007

Ms. Carol Longoria  
Public Information Coordinator  
Office of General Counsel  
University of Texas System  
201 West Seventh Street  
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2007-00196

Dear Ms. Longoria:

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# 268455.

The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston (the "center") received two requests for the proposals submitted in response to RFP# 744-6024 for Communication Integrator Services. You state that the submitted information may be excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.110, 552.113, and 552.131 of the Government Code, but make no arguments in support of these exceptions. Further, you provide documentation showing the center has notified Avaya, Inc. ("Avaya"), TechKnowledge Consulting Corporation ("TechKnowledge"), Trilliant Technology Group, Inc. ("Trilliant"), and Western Telecommunication Consulting, Inc. ("WTC") of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information should not be released. *See id.* § 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 reviewed the submitted information and considered the submitted arguments.

Initially, we note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of a governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) of the Government Code 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, Avaya, TechKnowledge, and Trilliant have not submitted comments to this office explaining why any portion of the submitted information relating to them should not be released to the requestors. Thus, we have no basis to conclude that the release of any portion of the submitted information relating to Avaya, TechKnowledge, and Trilliant would implicate their proprietary interests. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b) must show by *specific factual evidence* that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm). Accordingly, we conclude that the center may not withhold any portion of the submitted information based on the *proprietary interests* of Avaya, TechKnowledge, and Trilliant.

WTC argues that some of its information is confidential under the terms of its standard consulting agreement. We note that 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 a contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). Consequently, unless the information at issue falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released.

WTC argues that some of its information is 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: (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." 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 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 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), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (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 person’s claim for exception as valid under that component if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law.<sup>1</sup> *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). We cannot conclude, however, 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* under section 552.110(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983) (addressing statutory predecessor).

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 also* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Upon review of the submitted brief and information at issue, we find that WTC has established that some of the information it seeks to withhold constitutes *commercial or financial information*, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Thus, the center must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b). However, we determine that WTC has not demonstrated that any portion

---

<sup>1</sup>The 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).

of the remaining information constitutes trade secret information or commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause them substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5-6 (1990), 661 (1999) (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); *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”).

Finally, we note that some of the submitted information includes notice of copyright protection. 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 center must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestors, but any information protected by copyright must be released in accordance with 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,



Tamara L. Harswick  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TLH/jww

Ref: ID# 268455

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Shelly Hasselbrink  
Western Telecommunications Consulting, Inc.  
801 South Grand Avenue, Suite 700  
Los Angeles, California 90017  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David J. Jacobs  
Principal  
Techknowledge Consulting Corporation  
12 Greenway Plaza, Suite 1350  
Houston, Texas 77046  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Karen R. Oswald  
Client Executive  
Avaya, Inc.  
2900 North Loop West, Suite 1130  
Houston, Texas 77092  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Larry Walker  
President  
Trilliant Technology Group, Inc.  
701 North Post Oak Road, Suite 600  
Houston, Texas 77024  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Phillip Beidelman  
Western Telecommunications Consulting, Inc.  
801 South Grand Avenue, Suite 700  
Los Angeles, California 99017  
(w/o enclosures)