



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 1, 2014

Mr. Jerry Sorrells  
Records Management Officer  
Texas State Technical College  
3801 Campus Drive  
Waco, Texas 76705

OR2014-11341

Dear Mr. Sorrells:

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# 527891 (PIA request #s 105796, 109034, and 109040).

The Texas State Technical College (the "college") received three requests for information pertaining to RFP # 201412.<sup>1</sup> Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the requested information, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Scrip-Safe International ("Scrip-Safe"), National Student Clearinghouse, Parchment, Inc. ("Parchment"), and Credentials Solutions and state you have notified these third parties of the requests 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 arguments from Scrip-

---

<sup>1</sup>You state the college sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S. W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or overbroad request for information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

Safe and Parchment. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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 any of the remaining third parties explaining why their submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining 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 college may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest the remaining third parties may have in the information.

Scrip-Safe and Parchment claim portions of their information are excepted 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) of the Government Code 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>2</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).

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 Parchment has established a *prima facie* case its customer information constitutes trade secret information for purposes of section 552.110(a). Accordingly, to the extent the customer information at issue is not publicly available on the company’s website, the college must withhold the customer information at issue under section 552.110(a). However, Scrip-Safe and Parchment have failed to demonstrate that any of the remaining information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have these companies 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

---

<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, 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Consequently, none of the remaining information of Scrip-Safe or Parchment may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review, we find Parchment has demonstrated its pricing information constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive injury. Therefore, the college must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. We find, however, Scrip-Safe has failed to demonstrate 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). Accordingly, the college may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(b).

We note some of the submitted 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 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 college must withhold Parchment's customer information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code, provided the customer information has not been published on the company's website. The college must also withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The college must release the remaining information, but any information subject to 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,



Paige Lay  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

PL/som

Ref: ID# 527891

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 3 Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Brian Wilson  
Credentials Solutions, Inc.  
436 West Frontage Road, Suite 200  
Northfield, Illinois 60093  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Joseph E. Orndorff  
President & CEO  
SCRIP-SAFE International  
136 Commerce Boulevard  
Loveland, Ohio 45140  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark Koveleski  
National Student Clearinghouse  
2300 Dulles Station Boulevard, Suite 300  
Herndon, Virginia 20171  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Leonard Napolitano  
Parchment, Inc.  
6263 Scottsdale Road, Suite 330  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85250  
(w/o enclosures)