



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 1, 2013

Ms. Katheryne MarDock  
Assistant General Counsel  
Public Information Office  
Legal Services  
Houston Independent School District  
4400 West 18th Street  
Houston, Texas 77092-8501

OR2013-17039

Dear Ms. MarDock:

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# 500787.

The Houston Independent School District (the "district") received a request for the bid proposals submitted in response to request for proposals number 12-12-01. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified EIS Office Solutions ("EIS"); ELP Enterprises, Inc. ("ELP"); Enhanced Laser Products; Lee Office Solutions ("Lee"); Meredith Digital; Office Depot; QA Systems, Inc. ("QA Systems"); Rioch USA, Inc. ("Rioch"); Smart Group Systems ("Smart Group"); Standard Office Products; Tejas Office Products ("Tejas"); The Office Pal; Today's Business Solutions, L.L.C. ("TBS"); and US Tech of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted 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 received comments from ELP, Office Depot, and TBS. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note, and you acknowledge, the district has not complied with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Governmental Code in requesting this ruling. *See*

Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the information is public and must be released, unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information to overcome this presumption. *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, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). This office has held that a compelling reason exists to withhold information when the information is confidential by law or affects third party interests. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). Because third-party interests can provide a compelling reason for non-disclosure, we will consider whether the information at issue may be withheld on behalf of the third parties at issue.

We note 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 not received comments from EIS, Enhanced Laser Products, Lee, Meredith Digital, QA Systems, Rioch, Smart Group, Standard Office Products, Tejas, The Office Pal, or US Tech explaining why their information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of these third parties have a protected proprietary interest in the 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, the district may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest EIS, Enhanced Laser Products, Lee, Meredith Digital, QA Systems, Rioch, Smart Group, Standard Office Products, Tejas, The Office Pal, or US Tech may have in it.

ELP raises section 552.104 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure for its proposal. This section excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104. However, section 552.104 is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions which 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 district does not seek to withhold any information pursuant to section 552.104, no portion of ELP's information may be withheld on this basis.

ELP, Office Depot, and TBS claim portions of their information are excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which 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. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* ORD 552. 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 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 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).

---

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

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 (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).

Upon review, we find ELP has established that its customer information constitutes trade secrets. We also find TBS has established that some of its customer information constitutes trade secrets. Therefore, the district must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. We note, however, that TBS has published the identities of some of its customers on its website. Thus, TBS has failed to demonstrate that the information it has published on its website is a trade secret. Further, ELP, Office Depot, and TBS have failed to demonstrate that any of the remaining information they seek to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have ELP, Office Depot, or TBS demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. *See* ORD 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). Thus, none of ELP’s or TBS’s remaining information and none of Office Depot’s submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

We note TBS also argues that the release of its information at issue would have a chilling effect on the district’s ability to secure bidders or competitive pricing information. In advancing this argument, TBS appears to rely on the test pertaining to the applicability of the section 552(b)(4) exemption under the federal Freedom of Information Act to third-party information held by a federal agency, as announced in *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). The *National Parks* test provides that commercial or financial information is confidential if disclosure of information is likely to impair a governmental body’s ability to obtain necessary information in the future. *National Parks*, 498 F.2d 765. Although this office once applied the *National Parks* test under the statutory predecessor to section 552.110, that standard was overturned by the Third Court of Appeals when it held *National Parks* was not a judicial decision within the meaning of former section 552.110. *See Birnbaum v. Alliance of Am. Insurers*, 994 S.W.2d 766 (Tex. App.—Austin 1999, pet. denied). Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard to be applied and requires a specific factual demonstration the release of the information in question would cause the business enterprise that submitted the information substantial competitive harm. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of section 552.110(b) of the Government Code by Seventy-sixth Legislature). The ability of a governmental body to continue to obtain information from private parties is not a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *Id.* Therefore, we will consider only TBS’s interests in its information.

Upon review of ELP's, Office Depot's, and TBS's arguments under section 552.110(b), we find ELP and Office Depot have established that their pricing information constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the companies substantial competitive injury. Therefore, the district must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, because TBS has published the identities of its remaining customers on its website, making this information publicly available, the company has failed to demonstrate how release of this information would cause it substantial competitive harm. Additionally, we find that ELP, Office Depot, and TBS have made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of their remaining information would result in substantial damage to each company's competitive position. Thus, ELP, Office Depot, and TBS have not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of the remaining information at issue. *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). We note TBS is one of the winning bidders for the RFP at issue. This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest; thus, the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). *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). Further, the terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency). Accordingly, none of ELP's, Office Depot's, or TBS's remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

ELP claims some of its information is confidential under section 552.128 of the Government Code. Section 552.128 is applicable to "[i]nformation submitted by a potential vendor or contractor to a governmental body in connection with an application for certification as a historically underutilized or disadvantaged business under a local, state, or federal certification program[.]" Gov't Code § 552.128(a). However, ELP does not indicate it submitted the proposal in connection with an application for certification under such a program. Moreover, section 552.128(c) states that

[i]nformation submitted by a vendor or contractor or a potential vendor or contractor to a governmental body in connection with a specific proposed contractual relationship, a specific contract, or an application to be placed on a bidders list, including information that may also have been submitted in connection with an application for certification as a historically underutilized

or disadvantaged business, is subject to required disclosure, excepted from required disclosure, or confidential in accordance with other law.

*Id.* § 552.128(c). In this instance, ELP submitted its proposal to the district in connection with a specific proposed contractual relationship with the district. We therefore conclude the district may not withhold any portion of ELP's remaining information under section 552.128 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information that relates to a motor vehicle operator's license or driver's license or a motor vehicle title or registration issued by a Texas agency, or an agency of another state or country. *See id.* § 552.130(a)(1)-(2). Upon review, we find the district must withhold the motor vehicle record information we have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states 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." *Id.* § 552.136. This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, we find the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note 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. 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 sections 552.110, 552.130, and 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but any information protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

---

<sup>2</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

<sup>3</sup>Section 552.130(c) of the Government Code allows a governmental body to redact the information described in subsection 552.130(a) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Act of May 6, 2013, 83rd Leg., R.S., S.B. 458, § 1 (to be codified as an amendment to Gov't Code § 552.130(c)). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.130(e). *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(d), (e).

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Jennifer Luttrall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JL/som

Ref: ID# 500787

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Francisco Ramirez  
Counsel for Today's Business Solutions  
Francisco Ramirez & Associates, P.C.  
Three Riverway, Suite 555  
Houston, Texas 77056  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Heather Stern  
VP, Associate General Counsel  
Litigation/Business Solutions Division  
Office Depot  
6600 North Military Trail  
Boca Raton, Florida 33496  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Thomas Oldham  
Counsel for ELP Enterprises, Inc.  
Faubus Keller LLP  
1001 Texas Avenue, 11<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Houston, Texas 77002  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Merrill Chance  
Vice President  
EIS Office Solutions  
2030 West Sam Houston Parkway N  
Houston, Texas 77043  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Curtis Morris  
President  
Enhanced Laser Products  
9075 Katy Freeway  
Houston, Texas 77024  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Greg Healing  
Senior Account Representative  
Meredith Digital  
119 East Alton Avenue #A1B  
Santa Ana, California 92707  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Kelli Jennings  
National Account Supply Sales/MO  
Ricoh USA, Inc.  
16235 Swingley Ridge Drive  
Chesterfield, Missouri 63017  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark Futrell  
Standard Office Products  
6120 Jessamine Street  
Houston, Texas 77081  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Brenda Friedman  
The Office Pal  
P.O. Box 2  
Lakewood, New Jersey 08701  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Dee Dee Petrocco  
Vice President  
Lee Office Solutions  
3118 Harrisburg Boulevard  
Houston, Texas 77003  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Marcos Gurierrez  
Director of Operations  
QA Systems, Inc.  
5100 Westheimer, Suite 200  
Houston, Texas 77056  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mickey Faruque  
Smart Group Systems  
1801 Gateway Boulevard #203  
Richardson, Texas 75080  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. George Cosakis  
Nikki Pinto  
Tejas Office Products  
1225 West 20<sup>th</sup> Street  
Houston, Texas 77008  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Wen Lee Huang  
President  
US Tech  
1412 San Jacinto Mall  
Baytown, Texas 77521  
(w/o enclosures)