



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 19, 2012

Mr. Fred M. Barker
Assistant County Attorney
Parker County
118 West Columbia Street
Weatherford, Texas 76086

OR2012-14933

Dear Mr. Barker:

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# 465775.

The Parker County Purchasing Agent's Office (the "county") received a request for information pertaining to request for proposals number PC12-15, specifically, the responses of all competitors, scoring documents used by the county to determine awards, any communications, including e-mails, letters, and faxes that assisted the county in determining awards, and a complete copy of the county's contract with the winning competitor. You indicate some information has been released to the requestor. You state the final contract has not been drafted in its final form and has not been executed.¹ You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.110, and 552.147 of the Government Code.² Additionally, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Inmate Calling Solutions, LLC d/b/a ICSolutions, and its parent company Centric Group, LLC (collectively, "ICS"); Synergy Telecom Service

¹We note the Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. *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).

²We note section 552.147 of the Government Code is the proper exception to raise for social security numbers.

Company, Inc. (“Synergy”); and Securus Technologies, Inc. (“Securus”). Accordingly, you notified these third parties of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested 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 the circumstances). We have received comments submitted by ICS and Securus. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

We note an interested party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body’s notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from Synergy. Thus, we have no basis to conclude Synergy has a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); 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 county may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests Synergy may have in the information.

The county and Securus assert the submitted information is confidential because it was marked or designated as “confidential” when submitted to the county. However, information that is subject to disclosure under the Act may not be withheld simply because the party submitting it 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 information falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

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. Section 552.101 encompasses information other statutes make confidential. Prior decisions of this office have held section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code renders tax return information confidential. *See* Attorney General Opinion H-1274 (1978) (tax returns). Section 6103(b) defines the term “return information” as “a taxpayer’s identity, the nature, source, or amount of his income, payments, receipts, deductions, exemptions,

credits, assets, liabilities, net worth, tax liability, tax withheld, deficiencies, overassessments, or tax payments . . . or any other data, received by, recorded by, prepared by, furnished to, or collected by the Secretary [of the Internal Revenue Service] with respect to a return or with respect to the determination of the existence, or possible existence, of liability . . . for any tax, penalty, interest, fine, forfeiture, or other imposition, or offense[.]” 26 U.S.C. § 6103(b)(2)(A). 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). Thus, the submitted 1120S form and its attachments, which we have marked, constitute tax return information that is confidential under section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code and must be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.³ However, the remaining information the county has marked is not tax return information and it may not be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with federal law.

ICS raises section 552.104 for its information. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104. However, section 552.104 protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions which are intended to protect the interests of third parties. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 592 (1991)* (statutory predecessor to section 552.104 designed to protect interests of a governmental body in a competitive situation, and not interests of private parties submitting information to the government). As the county does not seek to withhold any information pursuant to section 552.104, no portion of ICS’s information may be withheld on this basis.

Although the county argues some of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, that exception is designed to protect the interests of third parties, not the interests of a governmental body. Thus, we do not address the county’s argument under section 552.110.

ICS and Securus each submit arguments against disclosure of their information under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 of the Government Code 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. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* ORD 552 at 2. Section 757 provides that a trade secret is:

³As our ruling is dispositive for this information, we do not address your claim under section 552.147 of the Government Code.

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.⁴ 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 result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5-6 (business

⁴The 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).

enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Upon review of the arguments and the submitted information, we find ICS and Securus have not demonstrated how any of their respective information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have these third parties demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); ORD 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim). Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Further, we find ICS and Securus have not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of their information would cause the companies substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 509 at 5 (1988) (because 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, and qualifications are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Accordingly, none of the information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note some of the information 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. 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 county must withhold the tax return information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. The remaining submitted information must be released, but any information 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, 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,



Kathleen J. Santos
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KJS/eb

Ref: ID# 465775

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Synergy Telecom Service Company, Inc.
12126 El Sendero
San Antonio, Texas 76233
(w/o enclosures)

IC Solutions
Attn: Ken Dawson
2200 Danbury Street
San Antonio, Texas 78217
(w/o enclosures)

Centric Group, LLC
1260 Andes Boulevard
St. Louis, Missouri 63132
(w/o enclosures)

Securus Technologies, Inc.
Attn: Mary Virginia Clark
14651 Dallas Parkway, 6th Floor
Dallas, Texas 75254-8815
(w/o enclosures)