



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

February 16, 2016

Mr. Jonathan Kaplan
Assistant City Attorney
Office of the City Attorney
City of San Antonio
P.O. Box 839966
San Antonio, Texas 78283-3966

OR2016-03674

Dear Mr. Kaplan:

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# 598393 (COSA File Nos. W103629-111715, W104801-120115, and W105057-120215).

The City of San Antonio (the "city") received three requests from different requestors seeking the proposals submitted in response to a specified request for proposals. Although you take 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 WatchGuard Video ("WatchGuard"); Voice Products, Inc. ("VP"); Digital Ally; L-3 Communications Mobile-Vision, Inc.; Safety Innovations International; Safety Vision, L.L.C.; Taser International Corp.; Viewu; and Wolfcom Enterprises. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified the third parties of the request for information 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 WatchGuard and VP. We have reviewed the submitted information and the submitted arguments.

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 id. § 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 information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining third parties has 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 city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest any of the remaining third parties may have in the information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code exempts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.”¹ Gov’t Code § 552.101. Section 552.101 of the Government Code encompasses section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. The submitted information contains corporate tax return information. 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). 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). Section 6103(b) defines the term “return information” as “a taxpayer’s identity, the nature, source, or amount of . . . income, payments, . . . tax withheld, deficiencies, over assessments, 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 . . . the determination of the existence, or possible existence, of liability . . . for any tax, penalty, . . . or offense[.]” *See* 26 U.S.C. § 6103(b)(2)(A). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103 of title 26 of the United States Code.

Section 552.104(a) of the Government Code exempts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104(a). A private third party may invoke this exception. *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015). The “test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder’s [or competitor’s information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage.” *Id.* at *9. WatchGuard states it has competitors. In addition, WatchGuard states the release of the information we have indicated would harm WatchGuard’s competitive position. After review of the information at issue and consideration of the arguments, we find WatchGuard has established the release of the information at issue would give

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

advantage to a competitor or bidder. Thus, we conclude the city may withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.104(a) of the Government Code.²

Next, VP states portions of its information are excepted from disclosure 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 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.³ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This

²As our ruling is dispositive of this information, we need not consider WatchGuard's remaining argument against its disclosure.

³The 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).

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.” 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 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).

VP argues the remaining 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. Upon review, we find VP has demonstrated portions of the information at issue constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the city must withhold this information, which we have indicated, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find VP has failed to demonstrate the release of any of its remaining information at issue 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 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), 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, the city may not withhold any of VP’s remaining information under section 552.110(b).

VP also asserts portions of its information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we conclude VP has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of its remaining information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find VP has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade

secret claim for its remaining information at issue. *See* ORD 402. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of VP's remaining information under section 552.110(a).

Section 552.130 excepts from disclosure information that relates to a motor vehicle operator's license or driver's license or a motor vehicle title or registration issued by a Texas agency, or an agency of another state or country. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1)-(2). Upon review, we find the city must withhold the discernible license plates in the submitted video recordings and photographs under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code provides, "[n]otwithstanding 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 concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Thus, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

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 city must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103 of title 26 of the United States Code. The city may withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.104 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the information we have indicated under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The city must withhold the discernible license plates in the submitted video recordings and photographs under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The city must withhold the insurance policy numbers in the remaining information under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information; however, 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](#), 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,



Joseph Behnke
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JB/som

Ref: ID# 598393

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 3 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gary E. Zausmer
Counsel for WatchGuard Video
Winstead
401 Congress Avenue, Suite 2100
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Stuart G. Peters
Vice President
Voice Products, Inc.
8555 East 32nd Street North
Wichita, Kansas 67226
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Heath Bideau
Digital Ally
9705 Loiret Boulevard
Lenexa, Kansas 66219
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Izzy Valdovino
L-3 Communications
90 Fanny Road
Boonton, New Jersey 07005
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Quinton Seamons
Safety Innovations International
2180 South 300 West, Suite 107
Salt Lake City, Utah 84115
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Steve Campbell
Safety Vision
6100 West Sam Houston Parkway North
Houston, Texas 77041
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Andrew Grayson
Taster International Corporation
17800 North 85th Street
Scottsdale, Arizona 85255
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Stephanie Olmsted
Viewu
105 West John Street
Seattle, Washington 98119
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Lorena Golveo
Wolfcom Enterprises
5910 West Sunset Boulevard
Hollywood, California 90028
(w/o enclosures)