



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

March 28, 2014

Mr. Jaime J. Muñoz  
Counsel for City of San Juan  
P.O. Box 47  
San Juan, Texas 78589

OR2014-05223

Dear Mr. Muñoz:

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# 518020.

The City of San Juan (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for the bid comparisons and bid proposals submitted in response to a specified request for proposals. You state, although the city takes no position with respect to the requested information, its release may implicate the interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state the city notified BBVA Compass Bank ("BBVA") and PlainsCapital Bank ("PCB") of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments stating 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); 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 reviewed the submitted information and the arguments submitted by a representative for PCB.

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, this office has not received comments from BBVA explaining why its information should not be released to the requestor. Thus, we have no basis to conclude the release of the submitted information

would implicate the interests of BBVA, and none of the submitted information may be withheld on that basis. *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.

Next, PCB asserts its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.112 of the Government Code. However, section 552.112 is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions that are intended to protect the interests of third parties. *See Birnbaum v. Alliance of Am. Insurers*, 994 S.W.2d 766, 776 (Tex. App.—Austin 1999, pet. denied) (section 552.112 is permissive exception that governmental body may waive in its discretion); Open Records Decision No. 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). The city did not assert section 552.112. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue pursuant to section 552.112.

PCB also asserts certain information pertaining to its clients is subject to common-law and constitutional privacy. Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 encompasses the doctrines of common-law and constitutional privacy. Common-law privacy protects information if it (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is 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 established. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has found that personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally intimate or embarrassing. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 9-10 (1992), 545 (1990), 523 (1989), 373 (1983). However, 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). Upon review, we find PCB has failed to demonstrate the information at issue is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Constitutional privacy consists of two interrelated types of privacy: (1) the right to make certain kinds of decisions independently and (2) an individual's interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. Open Records Decision No. 455 at 4 (1987). The first type protects an individual's autonomy within "zones of privacy" which include matters related to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education. *Id.* The second type of constitutional privacy requires a balancing between the individual's privacy interests and the public's need to know information of public concern. *Id.* The scope of information protected is narrower than that under the common law doctrine of privacy; the information must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *Id.* at 5 (quoting *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village, Texas*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985)). Upon review, we find PCB has failed to demonstrate the information at issue falls within the zones of privacy or otherwise implicates an individual's privacy interests for the purposes of constitutional privacy. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.101 in conjunction with constitutional privacy.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code 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. Gov't Code § 552.110. Section 552.110(a) protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure information that is trade secrets obtained from a person and information that is 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. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); *see also* ORD 552 at 2. Section 757 provides a trade secret to be as follows:

[A]ny formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] 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, as, for example, the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees . . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as, for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, 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) (citation omitted); *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> See 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 exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. ORD 552 at 5-6. 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. 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. *Id.*; ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

PCB claims some of its information constitutes trade secrets. Upon review, we find PCB has established a *prima facie* case that its client information constitutes trade secrets. Accordingly, to the extent PCB’s client information is not publicly available on the company’s website, the city must withhold PCB’s client information within the submitted information under section 552.110(a).<sup>2</sup> To the extent PCB’s client information is publicly available on the company’s website, the city may not withhold such information under section 552.110(a). In that event, we will address PCB’s argument under section 552.110(b) for the client information that is publicly available on the company’s website. However, we find PCB has failed to demonstrate the remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the remaining information on the basis of section 552.110(a).

---

<sup>1</sup>There are six factors the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company’s] business;
- (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 to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information; and
- (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).

<sup>2</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the company’s remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

PCB also contends its information is commercial or financial information, release of which would cause PCB substantial competitive harm. To the extent PCB's client information is publicly available on the company's website and not excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a), the city may not withhold such information under section 552.110(b). Upon review of PCB's arguments, we conclude PCB has not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of the remaining information would cause the company substantial competitive harm. *See* ORD 319 at 3 (statutory predecessor to section 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing). We therefore conclude the city may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.110(b).

PCB also raises section 552.137 of the Government Code for the remaining e-mail addresses within its proposal. Section 552.137 excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body," unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). However, section 552.137 does not except from release an e-mail address "contained in a response to a request for bids or proposals, contained in a response to similar invitations soliciting offers or information relating to a potential contract, or provided to a governmental body in the course of negotiating the terms of a contract or potential contract[.]" *Id.* § 552.137(c)(3). The e-mail addresses PCB seeks to withhold are subject to section 552.137(c)(3). Therefore, the city may not withhold the remaining e-mail addresses under section 552.137.

We note some of the submitted information appears to be subject to copyright law. 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, to the extent PCB's client information is not publicly available on the company's website, the city must withhold PCB's client information within the submitted information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information; however, any information protected by copyright may only 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.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,



Lindsay E. Hale  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LEH/akg

Ref: ID# 518020

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert Johnson, III  
Counsel for PlainsCapital Bank  
Gardere Wynne Sewell LLP  
600 Congress Avenue, Suite 3000  
Austin, Texas 78701-2978  
(w/o enclosures)

BBVA Compass Bank  
c/o Jaime J. Muñoz  
Attorney at Law  
P.O. Box 47  
San Juan, Texas 78589  
(w/o enclosures)