



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

April 23, 2015

Ms. Cynthia Tynan
Attorney & Public Information Coordinator
The University of Texas System
Office of General Counsel
201 West Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701-2902

OR2015-07834

Dear Ms. Tynan:

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# 561021 (OGC# 160014).

The University of Texas Health Science Center at Houston (the "university") received a request for information pertaining to a specified request for proposals. You state the university will release some information. You state the university will redact information pursuant to sections 552.136 and 552.147 of the Government Code.¹ 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 Dimedius, LLP ("Dimedius"). Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, you notified Dimedius of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestor. *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 Dimedius. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

¹Section 552.136(c) of the Government Code permits a governmental body to withhold the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from this office. *See* Gov't Code § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e). 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. *Id.* § 552.147(b).

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. We understand Dimedius to assert the submitted W-9 form is confidential under section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code, which is encompassed by section 552.101 of the Government Code. Prior decisions of this office have held section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code renders tax return information confidential. Attorney General Opinion H-1274 (1978) (tax returns); Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992) (W-4 forms), 226 (1979) (W-2 forms). Section 6103(b) defines the term “return information” as “a taxpayer’s identity, the nature, source, or amount of his income, payments, receipts, deductions, exemptions, credits, assets, liabilities, net worth, tax liability, tax withheld, deficiencies, overassessments, or tax payments . . . or any other data, received by, recorded by, prepared by, furnished to, or collected by the Secretary [of the Treasury] with respect to a return or with respect to the determination of the existence, or possible existence, of liability . . . for any tax, penalty, interest, fine, forfeiture, or other imposition, or offense[.]” See 26 U.S.C. § 6103(b)(2)(A). Federal courts have construed the term “return information” expansively to include any information gathered by the Internal Revenue Service regarding a taxpayer’s liability under title 26 of the United States Code. See *Mallas v. Kolak*, 721 F. Supp. 748, 754 (M.D.N.C. 1989), *aff’d in part*, 993 F.2d 1111 (4th Cir. 1993). However, W-9 tax forms are requests for taxpayer identification numbers and do not fall within the definition of “tax return information.” Therefore, the university may not withhold the submitted W-9 tax form under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code.

Dimedius also raises section 552.101 of the Government Code and cites to Open Records Decision No. 652 (1997). Open Records Decision No. 652 addressed under what circumstances the Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission, which has been renamed the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (the “commission”), must withhold from the public “trade secret” information pursuant to section 382.041 of the Health and Safety Code. See ORD 652 at 1 (addressing whether Health and Safety Code section 382.041 supplants common-law trade secret protection for certain information filed with the commission). Thus, we understand Dimedius to assert its information is confidential under section 382.041 of the Health and Safety Code. Section 382.041 provides in relevant part that “a member, employee, or agent of the commission may not disclose information submitted to the commission relating to secret processes or methods of manufacture or production that is identified as confidential when submitted.” Health & Safety Code § 382.041(a). By its own terms, section 382.041 pertains only to information submitted to the commission. See *id.*; see also ORD 652 at 5. The information at issue here was submitted to the university. Consequently, none of the information at issue is made confidential by section 382.041 of the Health and Safety Code, and the university may not withhold it under section 552.101 on that basis.

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. 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, 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.² 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 Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5* (1990). 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."

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

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 255, 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

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* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5 (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).

Dimedius asserts portions of its information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find Dimedius has established a *prima facie* case that its customer information constitutes trade secret information. Accordingly, to the extent Dimedius’s customer information is not publicly available on the company’s website, the university must withhold Dimedius’s customer information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, we conclude Dimedius has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of its remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find Dimedius has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its remaining information. *See* ORD 402. Therefore, the university may not withhold any of Dimedius’s remaining information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Dimedius also argues some of its information consists of commercial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find Dimedius has failed to demonstrate the release of any of its remaining information, including any customer information published on Dimedius’s website, would result in substantial harm to its competitive position. Furthermore, we note the contract for the specified request for proposals was awarded to Dimedius. 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 344-45 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). 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, the university may not withhold any of Dimedius’s information under section 552.110(b).

Dimedius raises section 552.131 of the Government Code for some of the remaining information. Section 552.131 relates to economic development information and provides, in part:

(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.

(b) Unless and until an agreement is made with the business prospect, information about a financial or other incentive being offered to the business prospect by the governmental body or by another person is excepted from [required public disclosure].

Gov't Code § 552.131(a)-(b). Section 552.131(a) protects the proprietary interests of third parties that have provided information to governmental bodies, not the interests of governmental bodies themselves. 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.* § 552.131(a). 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 Dimedius’s claims under section 552.110, the university may not withhold any of Dimedius’s information under section 552.131(a) of the Government Code. Additionally, we note section 552.131(b) is designed to protect the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. As the university does not assert section 552.131(b) as an exception to disclosure, we conclude no portion of the submitted information is excepted under section 552.131(b) 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, to the extent Dimedius's customer information is not publicly available on the company's website, the university must withhold Dimedius's customer information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The university must release the remaining information, but may only release any copyrighted 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,



Cristian Rosas-Grillet
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CRG/cbz

Ref: ID# 561021

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Rachel Conner
President
Dimedius, LLP
8000 Research Forest Drive, Suite 115-208
The Woodlands, Texas 77382
(w/o enclosures)