



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

July 22, 2015

Ms. Ashley D. Fourt  
Assistant Criminal District Attorney  
County of Tarrant  
401 West Belknap, Ninth Floor  
Fort Worth, Texas 76196-0201

OR2015-12350A

Dear Ms. Fourt:

Our office issued Open Records Letter No. 2015-12350 (2015) on June 23, 2015. Since that date, we have received a third-party brief from Quick Search that affects the facts on which this ruling was based. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (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 exceptions to disclosure under the Act in certain circumstances). Consequently, this decision serves as the corrected ruling and is a substitute for the decision issued on June 23, 2015. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.011 (providing that Office of Attorney General may issue decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of Public Information Act ("Act")). This ruling was assigned ID# 578166.

The Tarrant County Purchasing Department (the "department") received a request for the primary and secondary winning proposals for a specified request for proposals. Although the department takes no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Quick Search and Global Screening Solutions ("Global"). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the request and of their rights 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 comments from Quick Search and Global. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Global generally raises section 552.101 of the Government Code for a portion of its information. 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. However, Global has not pointed to any confidentiality provision, nor are we aware of any, that would make the information at issue confidential for purposes of section 552.101. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality). Therefore, the department may not withhold any portion of the information at issue under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Global argues its contract with its clients states their information will not be disclosed. However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract.”), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to Gov’t Code § 552.110). Consequently, unless the information falls within an exception to disclosure, the department must release it, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

Global claims, and we understand Quick Search to claim, portions of their information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which 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. 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. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990). 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>1</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 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. *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* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999).

Quick Search and Global claim portions of their information constitute trade secrets. However, upon review, we find Quick Search and Global have failed to demonstrate any portion of their information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have they demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for their information. *See* ORDs 402, 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). Therefore, the department may

---

<sup>1</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).

not withhold any portion of Quick Search's or Global's information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Quick Search and Global also claim portions of their information constitute commercial or financial information, the disclosure of which would cause the companies substantial competitive harm. However, upon review, we find Quick Search and Global have not demonstrated substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any portion of their information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 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). Additionally, we note Quick Search was one of the winning bidders. We note the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). 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 also* ORD 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing is not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). *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, no portion of the information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses common-law privacy, which 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*, 540 S.W.2d at 685. To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be demonstrated. *See id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation. Id.* at 683. Furthermore, the doctrine of common-law privacy protects a compilation of an individual's criminal history, which is highly embarrassing information, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person. *Cf. United States Dep't of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749, 764 (1989) (when considering prong regarding individual's privacy interest, court recognized distinction between public records found in courthouse files and local police stations and compiled summary of information and noted that individual has significant privacy interest in compilation of one's criminal history). We also find a compilation of a private citizen's criminal history is generally not of legitimate concern to the public. Upon review, we conclude the information we have marked meets the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. However, we are unable to determine whether this information pertains to actual living individuals or fictitious individuals created as samples for purposes of responding to the department's request for

proposals. Therefore, we must rule conditionally. To the extent the information we marked pertains to living individuals, the department must withhold this information pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. To the extent the information we marked does not pertain to living individuals, that information may not be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

The remaining documents include information that is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code. Section 552.136 provides, "Notwithstanding 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." Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, the department must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, to the extent the information we marked pertains to living individuals, the department must withhold this information pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold the information we marked under section 552.136. The remaining information must be released.

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,



Melanie J. Villars  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MJV/dls

Ref: ID# 578166

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Melanie Loggins  
Vice President  
Global Screening Solutions  
4833 Front Street, Unit B #448  
Castle Rock, Colorado 80104  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John V. Page  
Vice President  
Quick Search  
4155 Buena Vista  
Dallas, Texas 75204  
(w/o enclosures)