



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 31, 2014

Ms. Neera Chatterjee
Office of General Counsel
University of Texas System
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2013-01918

Dear Ms. Chatterjee:

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# 512571 (OGC# 153062).

The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center (the "university") received a request for the contract and proposals related to RFP# NUH 12-004. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the requested information, you state the proprietary interests of certain third parties might be implicated. Accordingly, you notified BKM Total Office of Texas, L.L.C. ("BKM"); Hill-Rom Company, Inc. ("Hill-Rom"); Medline Industries Holdings, L.P. ("Medline"); Owens & Minor ("Owens"); Sizewise Rentals, L.L.C. ("Sizewise"); and Stryker Medical ("Stryker") of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office explaining why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances). We have received arguments submitted by BKM, Sizewise, and Stryker. We have considered these arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note you have not submitted a copy of the requested contract. To the extent such information existed on the date the university received the request, we presume the university has released it. If not, you must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302; *see*

also Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to the requested information, it must release the information as soon as possible).

Next, an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received arguments from Hill-Rom, Medline, or Owens. Thus, none of these parties has demonstrated it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)–(b); 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 university may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests Hill-Rom, Medline, or Owens may have in the information.

BKM, Sizewise, and Stryker all present arguments under section 552.110 of the Government Code.¹ 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 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.

¹Although BKM does not cite a specific exception to disclosure, we understand it to raise section 552.110(b) based on the content of its arguments.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 776 (Tex. 1958). 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.² 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 (1990). However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable unless a party shows its information meets the definition of a trade secret and it demonstrates the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

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. *See id.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5.

Sizewise and Stryker argue that certain pricing information is a trade secret. Additionally, Sizewise argues certain quantity information is a trade secret. We note 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; *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 255, 232 (1979), 217 (1978). Further, we find Sizewise has not demonstrated its quantity information constitutes a trade secret, nor has it established the necessary factors for a trade secret claim. Accordingly, the university may not withhold Sizewise’s or Stryker’s pricing or quantity information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

BKM, Sizewise, and Stryker all argue the release of certain pricing information would cause substantial competitive harm. Sizewise also argues the release of its quantity information

²The 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* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

would cause substantial competitive harm. In advancing their arguments, BKM and Stryker rely in part 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 commercial or financial information is confidential if disclosure of information is likely to impair a governmental body's ability to obtain necessary information in future. *National Parks*, 498 F.2d at 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 that 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) 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 BKM's and Stryker's interest in the submitted information.

We note Stryker 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) of the Government Code. 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 344–45 (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 university may not withhold any of Stryker's pricing information under section 552.110(b). As for the pricing information related to BKM and Sizewise, we find the pricing information we marked consists of commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, the university must withhold the information we marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, Sizewise has not demonstrated the release of any of its remaining information would cause substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the university may not withhold any of Sizewise's remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, “[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.”³ Gov't

³The 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).

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. Thus, the university must withhold the insurance policy numbers we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.


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). However, 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 university must withhold the information we marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code and the information we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The university must release the remaining information 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.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,



Neal Falgoust
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NF/som

Ref: ID# 512571

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Carol Roehrig
President
BKM Total Office of Texas, LLC
9755 Clifford Drive, Suite 100
Dallas, Texas 75220
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Benjamin Prell
Counsel for Sizewise Rentals, LLC
Geiger Langin & Prell
10000 College Boulevard, Suite 100
Overland Park, Kansas 66210
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael F. Mason
Partner
Stryker Corporation
Hogan Lovells US, LLP
555 Thirteenth Street, NW
Washington, DC 20004
(w/o enclosures)

Hill-Rom Company, Inc.
1069 State Route 46 East
Batesville, Indiana 47006-9167
(w/o enclosures)

Medline Industries Holdings, LP
One Medline Place
Mundelein, Illinois 60060
(w/o enclosures)

Owens & Minor
9120 Lockwood Boulevard
Mechanicsville, Virginia 23116
(w/o enclosures)