



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

January 6, 2012

Mr. Bill Ballard  
Assistant County Attorney  
Brazos County  
300 East 26<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 325  
Bryan, Texas 77803

OR2012-00291

Dear Mr. Ballard:

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# 441563.

Brazos County (the "county") received a request for all proposals associated with the copier quote for the sheriff's office. We understand you to take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act; however you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Documentation, Inc. ("Documentation"); Dahill; and IKON Office Solutions ("IKON") of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information at issue 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 received comments from IKON. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the county did not comply with its deadlines under section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision. Section 552.301 prescribes procedures a governmental body must follow in asking this office to determine whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a). Section 552.301(b) requires the governmental body to ask for the attorney general's decision and claim its exceptions to disclosure not later than the tenth business day after the date of its receipt of the written request for information. *See id.* § 552.301(b). Section 552.301(e)

requires the governmental body to submit to this office, not later than the fifteenth business day after the date of its receipt of the request, (1) written comments stating why the governmental body's claimed exceptions apply to the information at issue; (2) a copy of the request for information; (3) a signed statement of the date of the governmental body's receipt of the request or evidence sufficient to establish the date of receipt; and (4) the specific information at issue or representative samples if the information is voluminous. *See id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A)-(D). Section 552.302 of the Government Code provides that if a governmental body fails to comply with section 552.301, the requested information is presumed to be subject to required public disclosure and must be released, unless there is a compelling reason to withhold any of the information. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ).

You inform us the county received the instant request for information on September 26, 2011; therefore, the county's deadlines under subsections 552.301(b) and 552.301(e) were October 10, 2011 and October 14, 2011, respectively. You requested this decision by United States mail meter-marked October 27, 2011. Thus, the county did not comply with section 552.301, and the submitted information is therefore presumed to be public under section 552.302. This statutory presumption can generally be overcome when information is confidential by law or third-party interests are at stake. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 3 (1994), 325 at 2 (1982). Because the third-party interests at issue here can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act.

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) of the Government Code 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, we have only received arguments from IKON. We, thus, have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information constitutes proprietary information of Documentation or Dahill. *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, the county may not withhold any of the submitted information based on the proprietary interests of Documentation or Dahill.

IKON claims its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. This section 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) “[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(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 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 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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958). This office will accept a private person’s claim for exception as valid under section 552.110(a) 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. *See* ORD 552 at 5. However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim.<sup>1</sup> Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. Gov’t Code § 552.110(b); ORD 661 at 5-6.

IKON claims information within its submitted bid proposal constitutes trade secrets under section 552.110(a). Upon review, we find IKON has not demonstrated how the information

---

<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 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).

it seeks to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret. *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939) (trade secret “is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business”); Open Records Decision Nos. 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim), 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Consequently, the county may not withhold any of IKON’s information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

We understand IKON to claim portions of its submitted information constitutes commercial information that, if released, would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Upon review, we find IKON has made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of its remaining information would cause the company substantial competitive injury. *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), 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. Furthermore, we note IKON was the winning bidder with respect to the contract at issue, and 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* Dep’t of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-345 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of the submitted information pursuant to section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note some of the submitted information 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. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). 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. Accordingly, the county must release the submitted information, 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, 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,



Jonathan Miles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JM/em

Ref: ID# 441563

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Lori Forter Ridyard  
IKON Office Solutions, Inc.  
70 Valley Stream Parkway  
Malvern, Pennsylvania 19355  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Joe Carver  
Documation, Inc.  
4700 Elmo Weedon Road, Suite 102  
College Station, Texas 77840  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Louis Hernandez  
Dahill  
809 University Drive East, Suite 100B  
College Station, Texas 77840  
(w/o enclosures)