



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 8, 2004

Ms. Ashley D. Fourt  
Assistant District Attorney  
Tarrant County Office of the Criminal District Attorney  
401 W. Belknap  
Fort Worth, Texas 76196-0201

OR2004-8538

Dear Ms. Fourt:

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# 210522.

The Tarrant County Sheriff's Department (the "department") received a request for all documentation submitted to the department by Swanson Services Corporation ("Swanson") in response to the most recent request for proposals for commissary services at the county jail. While you raise no exceptions to disclosure on behalf of the department, you indicate that release of the requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of Swanson. Accordingly you state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified Swanson of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under Act in certain circumstances). We have received correspondence from Swanson. We have considered Swanson's arguments and reviewed the submitted information. We have also received and considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (allowing interested party to submit comments indicating why requested information should or should not be released).

Initially, we address Swanson's arguments regarding the confidentiality of portions of its bid proposal, including its statement that it submitted its proposal to the department with a statement indicating that such information was to remain confidential. However, information that is subject to disclosure under the Act may not be withheld simply because the party submitting it anticipates or requests confidentiality. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 676-78 (Tex. 1976). Further, it is well-settled that a

governmental body's promise to keep information confidential is not a basis for withholding that information from the public, unless the governmental body has specific authority to keep the information confidential. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 514 at 1 (1988), 476 at 1-2 (1987, 444 at 6 (1986)). Consequently, the submitted information must fall within an exception to disclosure in order to be withheld.

Swanson argues that section 552.110 of the Government Code is applicable to portions of the submitted information. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private persons by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision and (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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b).

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a "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 [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 a single or ephemeral event 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. . . . [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 763, 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.<sup>1</sup> RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939).

---

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

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company];
- (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 [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information;
- (6) the ease or difficulty

This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we will accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception, and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) applies 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) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[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).

Swanson claims that portions of the requested information are protected under both prongs of section 552.110. Upon review of Swanson’s arguments and the submitted information, we find that Swanson has established that a portion of its proposal is excepted under section 552.110(a). Moreover, we have received no arguments that would rebut this case as a matter of law. We have marked this information, which the department must withhold. However, we find that Swanson has failed to establish the any of the remaining information it seeks to withhold is a trade secret for purposes of section 552.110(a). Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information pursuant to section 552.110(a).

Further, we conclude that Swanson has established that portions of its proposal are excepted under section 552.110(b). We have marked this information, which the department must withhold. However, we find that Swanson has failed to establish that release of any of its remaining information would cause Swanson substantial competitive injury as required by section 552.110(b). Therefore, none of the remaining responsive information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 509 at 5 (1988) (stating that 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 was entirely too speculative), 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization, personnel, and qualifications not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Accordingly, pursuant to section 552.110, the department must withhold only those portions of Swanson’s proposal that we have marked.

---

with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

Finally, we note that 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. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110. The department must release all remaining submitted information to the requestor; however, in doing so, the department must comply with the applicable copyright law for the portions of this information that are copyrighted.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental

body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Cary Grace". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above the typed name "Cary Grace".

Cary Grace  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ECG/jev

Ref: ID#

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Tonya Beane Webber  
Porter Rogers Dahlman & Gordon  
One Shoreline Plaza  
800 N. Shoreline, Suite 800  
Corpus Christi, Texas 78401-3708  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Alan J. Marcuis  
Hunton & Williams, LLP  
1601 Bryan Street, 30<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Dallas, Texas 75201-3000  
(w/o enclosures)