



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

February 5, 2008

Ms. Patricia Fleming  
Assistant General Counsel  
TDCJ-Office of the General Council  
P.O. Box 4004  
Huntsville, Texas 77342-4004

OR2008-01677

Dear Ms. Fleming:

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# 302781.

The Texas Department of Criminal Justice (the "department") received a request for responses to RFPs 696-PS-7-P041 and 696-PS-7-P045. You do not take a position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act; however, you state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified the following third parties of the department's receipt of the request for information and of the right of each to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestor: CEC Civigenics; Cenikor Foundation ("Cenikor"); David & Ivory Ministries; Gateway Foundation; Phoenix Houses of Texas; Travis Co. Counseling & Education; and WestCare California. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). Cenikor asserts that its information is excepted under sections 552.104 and 552.110 of the Government Code. We have reviewed the submitted arguments and information.

Initially, we note that some of the requested information was the subject of a previous request for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2008-01112 (2008). As we have no indication that the law, facts, and circumstances on which the prior ruling was based have changed, the department must continue to rely on that ruling as a previous determination and withhold or release this information in accordance with Open Records Letter No. 2008-01112. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as

law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure).

We next note that 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 it should be withheld from disclosure. See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Cenikor is the only third party that has submitted to this office any reasons explaining why the requested information should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information constitutes proprietary information of the remaining third parties, and the department may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on that basis. See 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).

Cenikor argues that its information is excepted under section 552.104 of the Government Code. We note that section 552.104 is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions that are intended to protect the interests of third parties. See Open Records Decision Nos. 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), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). As the department does not seek to withhold any information pursuant to section 552.104, we find this section does not apply to the submitted information. See ORD 592 (governmental body may waive section 552.104). Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the information at issue pursuant to section 552.104.

Cenikor also asserts that its information is excepted 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: trade secrets and commercial or financial information the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. Section 552.110(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision." 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. 1958); see also ORD 552 at 2. 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); *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776. In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret as well as the Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.<sup>1</sup> Restatement of Torts § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. ORD 552 at 5-6. However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) applies 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). We also note that pricing information pertaining to a particular contract is generally not a trade secret because 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." Restatement of Torts § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982).

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* ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm). However, the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 514 (1988) (public has interest in

---

<sup>1</sup>The following are the six factors that the Restatement gives 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 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 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).

knowing prices charged by government contractors), 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing is not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). *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). Moreover, we believe the public has a strong interest in the release of prices in government contract awards. *See* ORD 514.

We find Cenikor has established that the release of some of the information at issue would cause substantial competitive injury; therefore, the department must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b). But Cenikor has made only conclusory allegations that release of the remaining information at issue would cause substantial competitive injury, and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. In addition, we conclude Cenikor has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any of the remaining information is a trade secret. *See* ORD 402. Thus, the remaining information may not be withheld under section 552.110.

The submitted information contains insurance policy numbers. Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides 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.” The department must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136.

Finally, we note that some of the materials at issue 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).

To conclude, the department must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.110 and 552.136 of the Government Code. The department must release the remaining information, but any copyrighted information may only 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,



James L. Coggeshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLC/jh

Ref: ID# 302781

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Carrie A. Carter  
The Turning Point, Inc.  
P.O. Box 771236  
Houston, Texas 77215-1236  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Denise Hicks  
Cenikor Foundation, Inc.  
7676 Hillmont Street, Suite 190  
Houston, Texas 77040  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Darcy  
Gateway Foundation  
5821 Southwest Freeway  
Houston, Texas 77057  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Terrence White  
David & Ivory Ministries  
4728 Gunter Street  
Houston, Texas 77020  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Shawn Jenkins, Sr.  
WestCare California  
P.O. Box 12107  
Fresno, California 93776  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Monty Mueller  
Phoenix Houses of Texas  
2345 Reagan Street  
Dallas, Texas 75219  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Chris Rush  
CEC Civigenics  
75 Livingston Avenue  
Roseland, New Jersey 07068  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark Spacht  
Travis Co. Counseling & Education  
5501 Airport Boulevard  
Austin, Texas 78751  
(w/o enclosures)