



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

January 21, 2010

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

OR2010-00996

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# 367578.

The Tarrant County Purchasing Department (the "department") received a request for the following categories of information pertaining to CTJ Maintenance, Inc. ("CTJ"): (1) contract with the department; (2) bid packet for Bid No. 2007-161; (3) certificates of insurance; (4) invoices received since September 2006; (5) number of employees provided to the department; and (6) information pertaining to injury or incident reports. You state the department has released some of the requested information. You also state the department does not have any information responsive to category 6.<sup>1</sup> Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of CTJ. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified CTJ of the request for information and of its

---

<sup>1</sup>The Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received, nor does it require a governmental body to prepare new information in response to a request. *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Attorney General Opinion H-90 (1973); Open Records Decision Nos. 452 at 2-3 (1986), 342 at 3 (1982), 87 (1975); see also Open Records Decision Nos. 572 at 1 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990), 416 at 5 (1984).

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 comments from CTJ. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that the department has marked portions of the submitted information as not responsive to the instant request. The department need not release nonresponsive information in response to this request, and this ruling will not address that information.

CTJ asserts that its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information that (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The type of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. This office has found that personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545 (1990). Upon review, we find that the personal financial information we have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the department must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Next, CTJ asserts its information is confidential 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. Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b). Section 552.110(a) protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See id.* § 552.110(a). A "trade secret"

may consist of 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 single or ephemeral events 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. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as, for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, 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); Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (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 to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information; and
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see also* ORD 232. This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). 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. 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.* § 552.110(b); ) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret).

Having considered CTJ’s assertion under section 552.110(a), we determine that CTJ has failed to demonstrate that any portion of its submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. We note that 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 business,” rather than “a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business.” *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982). Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of CTJ’s submitted information on the basis of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review of CTJ’s arguments under section 552.110(b), we find that CTJ has made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of its information would result in substantial damage to the company’s competitive position. Thus, CTJ has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of its 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). Furthermore, we note that the submitted contract was awarded, in part, to CTJ by the department. 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* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Accordingly, none of CTJ’s information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

We note that a portion of the submitted information is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> Section 552.136 states that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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. Accordingly, we find that the department must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup>

We also note that some of the remaining information is 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. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of materials that are subject to copyright protection unless an exception applies to the information. *See 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 marked personal financial information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The department must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but any information subject to copyright may only be released in accordance with federal copyright law.<sup>4</sup>

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.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php).

---

<sup>2</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

<sup>3</sup>We note this office recently issued Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009), a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision.

<sup>4</sup>We note that the information being released contains social security numbers. 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 under the Act.

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 must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Jennifer Luttrall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JL/dls

Ref: ID# 367578

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Harold Jenkins  
CTJ Maintenance, Inc.  
3649 Conflans Road  
Irving, Texas 75061  
(w/o enclosures)