



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

November 29, 2011

Ms. Zeena Angadicheril  
Office of General Counsel  
The University of Texas System  
201 West Seventh Street  
Austin, Texas 78701

OR2011-17546

Dear Ms. Angadicheril:

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# 435977 (OGC# 139524).

The University of Texas at Austin (the "university") received a request for a specified contract. Although you take no position on whether the requested information is excepted from disclosure, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of IMG College, LLC ("IMG") and St. David's Health Care Partnership, L.P., LLP ("St. David's"). Accordingly, you have notified both IMG and St. David's of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). We have received comments from IMG and St. David's. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

IMG and St. David's contend that the submitted information is not subject to disclosure under the Act. Section 552.021 of the Government Code provides for public access to "public information," *see* Gov't Code § 552.021, which is defined by section 552.002 of the Government Code as "information that is collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business: (1) by a governmental

body; or (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body owns the information or has a right of access to it.” *Id.* § 552.002(a). Thus, information that is collected, assembled, or maintained by a third party may be subject to disclosure under the Act if a governmental body owns or has a right of access to the information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 462 (1987); *cf.* Open Records Decision No. 499 (1988). Both IMG and St. David’s assert the submitted information is not subject to the Act because it was generated by IMG and St. David’s, which are not governmental bodies subject to the Act, and it consists of an agreement between two private parties that does not involve the university. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.003(1)(A) (defining “governmental body”). We note, however, the submitted agreement relates to the university’s athletic program and sponsorship of the university, as well as the provision of medical services to the university. IMG informs us the university approves the sponsors and the business terms, and IMG enters into sponsorship agreements with the sponsors. We further note that the submitted information is in the possession of the university. Moreover, the university has submitted this information as being subject to the Act. Thus, we find that the university collected, assembled, or maintains this information in connection with the transaction of its official business. We therefore conclude that the submitted information is subject to the Act and must be released, unless it is demonstrated that the information falls within an exception to disclosure under the Act. *See id.* §§ 552.006, .021, .301, .302.

Next, St. David’s asserts the submitted contract is excepted from disclosure because it is subject to a confidentiality clause. We note that information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *See 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. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [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 section 552.110). Consequently, unless the contract falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement specifying otherwise.

IMG and St. David’s both assert the submitted information is excepted 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. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (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 (1939). 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 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

---

<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 (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999) at 5-6.

Both IMG and St. David's contend the information at issue consists of trade secret information excepted under section 552.110(a). Upon review, we find that IMG and St. David's have failed to demonstrate that the pricing information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have IMG or St. David's demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for the information at issue. We note information pertaining to a particular contract, including pricing information, 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 (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). Accordingly, we find none of the information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review, we find that IMG and St. David's have made only conclusory allegations that the release of the information at issue would result in substantial damage to their competitive positions. *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 was entirely 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, we conclude no portion of the information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note portions 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. As no further exceptions are raised, the university must release the submitted information, but any information that is protected by 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.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php), 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,



Vanessa Burgess  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

VB/dls

Ref: ID# 435977

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bruce B. Siegal  
Senior Vice President and Counsel  
IMG College (successor to IMG Communications, Inc.)  
290 Interstate North Circle, Suite 200  
Atlanta, Georgia 30339  
(Third party w/o enclosures)

St. David's Healthcare Partnership  
c/o Ms. Missy Atwood  
Germer, Gertz, Beaman & Brown, L.L.P.  
301 Congress Avenue, Suite 1700  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(Third party w/o enclosures)