



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

June 21, 2010

Mr. Robert L. Blumenfeld  
Mendel Blumenfeld, L.L.P.  
5809 Acacia Circle  
El Paso, Texas 79912

OR2010-09026

Dear Mr. Blumenfeld:

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# 383372.

El Paso Mental Health and Mental Retardation ("MHMR"), which you represent, received a request for the bid tabulation and proposals submitted in response to a RFP for office supplies. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.104 and 552.110 of the Government Code. You also state the submitted documents may contain proprietary information of third parties subject to exception under the Act. Accordingly, you state you notified Office Depot, Eraser Dust, and Staples, Inc. of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released. *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).* We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

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 information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B).* As of the date of this letter, we have received comments only from Office Depot explaining why portions of its information should not be released. Therefore,

we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining companies have protected proprietary interests in their submitted information. *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. Accordingly, MHMR may not withhold these companies' proposals on the basis of any proprietary interest they may have in them.

Section 552.104 of the Government Code protects from required public disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104. The purpose of section 552.104 is to protect the interests of a governmental body in competitive bidding situations where the governmental body wishes to withhold information in order to obtain more favorable offers. *See* ORD 592. Section 552.104 protects information from disclosure if the governmental body demonstrates potential harm to its interests in a particular competitive situation. *See* Open Records Decision No. 463 (1987). Generally, section 552.104 does not except bids from disclosure after bidding is completed and the contract has been awarded. *See* Open Records Decision No. 541 (1990). However, in some situations, section 552.104 will operate to protect from disclosure bid information that is submitted by successful bidders. *See id.* at 5 (recognizing limited situation in which statutory predecessor to section 552.104 continued to protect information submitted by successful bidder when disclosure would allow competitors to accurately estimate and undercut future bids).

We note the responsive information relates to a contract that MHMR has already awarded. You have provided general assertions that release of this information would harm the interests of MHMR and other third parties. However, we conclude the information at issue does not reflect MHMR is engaging in any particular competitive bidding situation and you have not sufficiently explained the applicability of section 552.104 to the information you seek to withhold under this exception. *See* Open Records Decision No. 509 at 5 (1998) (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 was entirely too speculative to withhold information under predecessor statute). Consequently, MHMR may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Next, although MHMR argues that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code, that exception is designed to protect the interests of third parties, not the interests of a governmental body. Thus, we will only address Office Depot's arguments under section 552.110.

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 trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 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. 1957); *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); *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 must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* ORD 552 at 5. However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable

---

<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).

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). We note that pricing information is generally not a trade secret under section 552.110(a) 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." See RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); see also *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776.

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 ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Upon review, we find that Office Depot has established a *prima facie* case that its customer information and pricing information constitute trade secrets. Thus, MHMR must withhold the information we marked under section 552.110(a). However, we find Office Depot has failed to establish how any of its remaining information constitutes trade secrets under section 552.110(a). See RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939) (information is generally not trade secret unless it constitutes "a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business"). Thus, no portion of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Next, Office Depot asserts that remaining portions of its information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). However, we find Office Depot has made conclusory or generalized allegations or failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating that release of any of the remaining submitted information would result in substantial competitive harm to its interests. See Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (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), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Accordingly, we determine that no portion of the remaining information at issue is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note the remaining information contains insurance policy numbers. Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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.”<sup>2</sup> Gov’t Code § 552.136(b). This office has determined that insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). We note the requestor has a right of access to her own company’s insurance policy numbers. *See id.* § 552.023(a)<sup>3</sup>; Open Records Decision No. 481 at 4 (1987). Therefore, the MHMR must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code.<sup>4</sup>

Finally, we note that some of the remaining information at issue appears to be protected by copyright. A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information, but a custodian of public records must comply with copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). Thus, 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, MHMR must withhold the information we marked under sections 552.110 and 552.136. The remaining information must be released, but any information protected by copyright must be released in accordance with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php), or call the Office of the Attorney General’s Open Government Hotline, toll free,

---

<sup>2</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception, such as section 552.136, on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

<sup>3</sup> Section 552.023(a) provides that “[a] person or a person’s authorized representative has a special right of access, beyond the right of the general public, to information held by a governmental body that relates to the person and that is protected from public disclosure by laws intended to protect that person’s privacy interests.” Gov’t Code § 552.023(a).

<sup>4</sup> We note that this office recently issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including insurance policy numbers under section 552.136, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Chris Schulz  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CS/tp

Ref: ID# 383372

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Heather Stern  
Senior Managing Counsel and Government Relations  
Office Depot, Inc.  
6600 North Military Trail  
Boca Raton, Florida 33496  
(w/o enclosures)

Staples, Inc.  
c/o Robert Blumenfeld  
Mendel Blumenfeld, L.L.P.  
5809 Acacia Circle  
El Paso, Texas 79912  
(w/o enclosures)

Eraser Dust  
c/o Robert Blumenfeld  
Mendel Blumenfeld, L.L.P.  
5809 Acacia Circle  
El Paso, Texas 79912  
(w/o enclosures)