



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 19, 2012

Ms. Bertha Bailey Whatley  
Chief Legal Counsel  
Office of Legal Services  
Fort Worth Independent School District  
100 North University Drive, Suite 172  
Fort Worth, Texas 76107

OR2012-05610

Dear Ms. Whatley:

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# 451129.

The Fort Worth Independent School District (the "district") received a request for Tyler Technologies, Inc.'s ("Tyler") response to Proposal Number: 06-131, Proposal Title: ERP System Acquisition and Implementation. You claim portions of the requested information are excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.110 of the Government Code. You have also notified Tyler of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information and considered comments submitted by Tyler.

Initially, we note the submitted contract and the RFP issued by the district, which we have marked, are not responsive to the instant request for information. The requestor only seeks Tyler's RFP response. Accordingly, only the RFP response is responsive to this request. The ruling does not address the public availability of the non-responsive information, and that information need not be released.

The district raises section 552.101 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by

judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. However, you do not cite to any specific law, and we are not aware of any, that makes any of the information at issue confidential under section 552.101. *See id.* § 552.101. Therefore, the district may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

The district and Tyler assert portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. However, section 552.110 protects only the interests of a third party that has provided information to a governmental body, not those of the governmental body itself. Accordingly, we consider only the arguments we received from Tyler under section 552.110. 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) 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. This office must accept a private person’s claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima*

---

<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; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

*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 section 552.110(a) applies 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

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, 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 release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Tyler seeks to withhold some of its submitted information under section 552.110(a). Upon review we find Tyler has not demonstrated how any of its information at issue, including its pricing information and information that was tailored to this particular proposal, 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 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, and qualifications not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Consequently, the district may not withhold any of Tyler’s information under section 552.110(a).

Tyler also seeks to withhold some of its submitted information under section 552.110(b). We note the pricing information of a winning bidder, such as Tyler, 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). Furthermore, we find Tyler has made only conclusory allegations that release of its remaining information at issue would result in substantial competitive injury. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 509 at 5 (1988) (because 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. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of Tyler’s information at issue under section 552.110(b).

We note the submitted information includes insurance policy numbers. Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides 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); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136.

Finally, we note some of the remaining information is 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.

In summary, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. 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, 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,



Tamara H. Holland  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

THH/ag

---

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

Ref: ID# 451129

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

H. Lynn Moore, Jr.  
Executive Vice President and General Counsel  
Tyler Technologies, Inc.  
6500 International Parkway, Suite 2000  
Plano, Texas 75093  
(w/o enclosures)