



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

March 7, 2014

Ms. Leticia D. McGowan  
School Attorney  
Dallas Independent School District  
3700 Ross Avenue  
Dallas, Texas 75204

OR2014-03979

Dear Ms. McGowan:

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# 515983.

The Dallas Independent School District (the "district") received a request for eight categories of information pertaining to requests for qualifications for real estate brokerage services for specified bond programs. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.107, 552.110, 552.111 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> You also claim release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, the district has notified Andrews & Associates Realty; CB Richard Ellis, Inc.; Felder Griffin Realty Group; Les Callison Real Estate; Lincoln Property Company Commercial, Inc.; Regional Realty Advisors, LLC; Solender/Hall, Inc.; The Blaydes Group; The OKPA Company, LLC; DFW Advisors Ltd. Co.; Resource Advisory Services, Inc.; and The Collins Company ("Collins") of the request

---

<sup>1</sup>Although you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with the attorney-client privilege under Texas Rule of Evidence 503 and with the attorney work product privilege under Texas Rule of Civil Procedure 192.5, this office has concluded that section 552.101 does not encompass discovery privileges. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 676 at 1-2 (2002), 575 at 2 (1990). Furthermore, we note the proper exceptions to raise when asserting the attorney-client privilege and the attorney work product privilege for information not subject to section 552.022 of the Government Code are sections 552.107 and 552.111, respectively. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 677 (2002), 676 at 1-2.

and of their right to submit comments to this office as to why the requested 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 that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under the Act in certain circumstances). We have received correspondence from Collins. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, 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 received comments from Collins. We have not received comments from any of the remaining interested third parties. Thus, the remaining interested third parties have failed to demonstrate they have a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1990) (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 submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest any of the remaining third parties may have in the information.

Collins raises section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy for some of its information. Common-law privacy protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683.

We note common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals, not those of corporate and other business entities. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); *see also* *Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989) (corporation has no right to privacy (citing *United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950))), *rev'd on other grounds*, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990). We also note an individual's name, education, prior employment, and personal information are not ordinarily private information subject to common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision

Nos. 554 (1990), 448 (1986). Upon review, we find no portion of the information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and of no legitimate public concern. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of common-law privacy.

Collins asserts some of its information is excepted from public disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code, which excepts "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." *See* Gov't Code § 552.104(a). This exception protects the competitive interests of governmental bodies such as the district, not the proprietary interests of private parties. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8 (1991) (discussing statutory predecessor). In this instance, the district does not raise section 552.104 as an exception to disclosure. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Collins also asserts some of its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Although the district also claims section 552.110 for the submitted information, this exception is designed to protect the interests of third parties, not the interests of a governmental body. Thus, we do not address the district's argument under section 552.110 of the Government Code. 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 that are 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, 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 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.<sup>2</sup> RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office must accept a claim 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 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. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). 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 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

Section 552.110(b) protects "[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence 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, substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; see also ORD 661 at 5.

Collins asserts portions of its information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, upon review, we find Collins has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of its information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has Collins demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its information. Therefore, none of Collins' information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Collins also argues portions of its information consist of commercial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find Collins has made only conclusory allegations that

---

<sup>2</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 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

release of any of its information would result in substantial harm to its competitive position. *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 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 (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, none of Collins' information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Collins also raises section 552.131 of the Government Code. Section 552.131 relates to economic development information and provides, in part, the following:

(a) Information is excepted from [required public disclosure] if the information relates to economic development negotiations involving a governmental body and a business prospect that the governmental body seeks to have locate, stay, or expand in or near the territory of the governmental body and the information relates to:

- (1) a trade secret of the business prospect; or
- (2) commercial 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 § 552.131(a). Section 552.131(a) excepts from disclosure only "trade secret[s] of [a] business prospect" and "commercial 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." *Id.* This aspect of section 552.131 is co-extensive with section 552.110 of the Government Code. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b). Because we have already disposed of Collins' claims under section 552.110, the district may not withhold any of Collins' information under section 552.131(a) of the Government Code.

We now address the district's remaining arguments against disclosure. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a

governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a *confidential* communication, *id.*, meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5).

Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein). You claim some of the submitted information is protected by the attorney-client privilege. You state the information at issue was exchanged between district representatives and legal counsel representing the district in order to facilitate the rendition of legal services to the district. You explain this information was intended to be, and has remained, confidential. Accordingly, the district may withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.107 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

We note some of the remaining 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 to disclosure

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the district’s remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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 copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the district may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code. The district must release the remaining information; however, any information subject to copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.<sup>4</sup>

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,



Miriam A. Khalifa  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MAK/akg

Ref: ID# 515983

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>4</sup>We note the information being released contains a social security number. Section 552.147(b) of the Government Code authorizes a governmental body to redact a living person's social security number from public release without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. See Gov't Code § 552.147(b).

Gerald Andrews  
Andrews & Associates Realty  
1402 Corinth Street  
Dallas, Texas 75215  
(w/o enclosures)

Christine Mickey  
CB Richard Ellis, Inc.  
5430 LBJ Freeway, Suite 1100  
Dallas, Texas 75240  
(w/o enclosures)

Kevin Felder  
Felder Griffin Realty Group  
8404 Capriola Lane  
Dallas, Texas 75228  
(w/o enclosures)

Les Callison  
Les Callison Real Estate  
777 South Central Expressway, Suite 6-C  
Richardson, Texas 75080  
(w/o enclosures)

Michael Peinado  
Lincoln Property Company Commercial, Inc.  
3300 Lincoln Plaza  
500 N. Akard Street  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
(w/o enclosures)

Charles Rencher  
Regional Realty Advisors, LLC  
2531 Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.  
Dallas, Texas 75215  
(w/o enclosures)

Elizabeth Solender  
Solender/Hall Inc.  
P.O. Box 670009  
Dallas, Texas 75367-0009  
(w/o enclosures)

William D. Blaydes  
The Blaydes Group  
9628 Dartridge Drive  
Dallas, Texas 75238  
(w/o enclosures)

William D. Blaydes  
Resource Advisory Services, Inc.  
6510 Abrams Road, Suite 620  
Dallas, Texas 75231  
(w/o enclosures)

Edward Okpa, II  
The OKPA Company, LLC  
P.O. Box 1132  
Addison, Texas 75001  
(w/o enclosures)

James L. Falvo  
DFW Advisors Ltd. Co.  
4600 Greenville Avenue, Suite 150  
Dallas, Texas 75206  
(w/o enclosures)

Bian Beverly  
For The Collins Company  
1227 Jeanette Way  
Carrollton, Texas 75006  
(w/o enclosures)