



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 2, 2013

Ms. Sylvia McClellan
Assistant City Attorney
Criminal Law and Police Section
City of Dallas
1400 South Lamar Street
Dallas, Texas 75215

OR2013-00026

Dear Ms. McClellan:

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# 476055 (DPD OR#s 2012-10857 and 2012-11055).

The Dallas Police Department (the "department") received two requests from the same requestor for the case file and all audio and video recordings pertaining to a specified investigation. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.103, 552.111, 552.117, and 552.136 of the Government Code. Additionally, you indicate release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Bluebonnet Waste Control, Inc. ("Bluebonnet"). Accordingly, you notified Bluebonnet of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why its 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 an attorney for

Bluebonnet. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.¹

Initially, you inform us some of the requested information was the subject of a previous request for information, as a result of which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2012-13673 (2012). In Open Records Letter No. 2012-13673, we determined the department may withhold the submitted information pursuant to section 552.116 of the Government Code. We have no indication there has been any change in the law, facts, or circumstances on which the prior ruling was based. Accordingly, to the extent the submitted information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office, we conclude the department may rely on Open Records Letter No. 2012-13673 as a previous determination and withhold the identical responsive information in accordance with that ruling. *See* Open Records Decision No. 673 (2001) (so long as law, facts, and circumstances on which prior ruling was based have not changed, first type of previous determination exists where requested information is precisely same information as was addressed in prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). To the extent the submitted information is not encompassed by the previous ruling, we will address your arguments against its disclosure.

Next, you acknowledge, and we agree, the department did not comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless a compelling reason exists to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a compelling reason to withhold information exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Although you raise sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code, these are discretionary exceptions to disclosure that protect only a governmental body's interests and may be waived. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469 (Tex. App.—Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 677

¹We assume the "representative sample" of information submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent those records contain substantially different types of information than those submitted to this office.

at 10 (2002) (attorney work-product privilege under section 552.111 is not compelling reason to withhold information under section 552.302), 665 at 2 n.5 (2000) (discretionary exceptions in general), 663 at 5 (1999) (waiver of discretionary exceptions), 473 (1987) (section 552.103 may be waived). As such, sections 552.103 and 552.111 of the Government Code do not provide compelling reasons to withhold information for purposes of section 552.302. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.103 or section 552.111 of the Government Code. However, you also raise sections 552.117 and 552.136 of the Government Code, which can provide compelling reasons to withhold information. In addition, we note some of the submitted information is subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code, which also can provide a compelling reason to withhold information.² Therefore, we will address the applicability of these sections to the submitted information.

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 the common-law right of privacy, which protects information if it (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). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be established. *Id.* at 681-82. We understand Bluebonnet to assert that some of its submitted information is protected by common-law privacy. We note, however, common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals, not those of corporate and other business entities. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); *see also United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950) (cited in *Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989), *rev’d on other grounds*, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990) (corporation has no right to privacy)). Accordingly, no portion of Bluebonnet’s submitted information may be withheld under section 552.101 on the basis of common-law privacy.

Bluebonnet also asserts some of the submitted information is 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

²The 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).

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.³ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. 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

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

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

Upon review, we find that Bluebonnet has failed to demonstrate how any portion of the submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 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), 319 at 2 (1982) (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). We further 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 Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Therefore, the department may not withhold any of Bluebonnet’s submitted information pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Bluebonnet claims that some of its submitted information, if released, would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Upon review, however, we find Bluebonnet has not made a specific factual or evidentiary showing that release of the submitted information would cause it substantial competitive injury. *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 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. Additionally, we note this office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). *See generally* Dep’t of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-45 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Consequently, the department may not withhold any of Bluebonnet’s submitted information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Bluebonnet also raises sections 552.103, 552.108, and 552.116 of the Government Code for the submitted information. Section 552.103 excepts from disclosure “information relating to litigation of a civil or criminal nature to which the state or a political subdivision is or may be a party or to which an officer or employee of the state or a political subdivision, as a consequence of the person’s office or employment, is or may be a party.” Gov’t

Code § 552.103(a). Section 552.108(a)(2) excepts from disclosure “[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . it is information that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime only in relation to an investigation that did not result in conviction or deferred adjudication[.]” *Id.* § 552.108(a)(2). Section 552.116 excepts from disclosure “an audit working paper of an audit of the state auditor or the auditor of a state agency, an institution of higher education as defined by Section 61.003, Education Code, a county, a municipality, a school district, a hospital district, or a joint board operating under Section 22.074 Transportation Code, including any audit relating to the criminal background check of a public school employee[.]” *Id.* § 552.116. However, we note section 552.103, section 552.108, and section 552.116 are discretionary exceptions which protect only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions which are intended to protect the interests of third parties, and may be waived by the governmental body. *See Dallas Area Rapid Transit v. Dallas Morning News*, 4 S.W.3d 469, 475-76 (Tex. App.— Dallas 1999, no pet.) (governmental body may waive section 552.103); Open Records Decision Nos. 522 at 4 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general), 177 (1977) (governmental body may waive statutory predecessor to section 552.108). Because the department has waived its claim under section 552.103 and does not seek to withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.108 or section 552.116, we will not consider the applicability of these sections to the submitted information.

Section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure the home addresses and telephone numbers, emergency contact information, social security numbers, and family member information of current or former officials or employees of a governmental body who request that this information be kept confidential under section 552.024 of the Government Code. Gov’t Code §§ 552.024, .117(a)(1). Section 552.117(a)(1) is also applicable to personal cellular telephone numbers, provided the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body. *See Open Records Decision No. 506* at 5-6 (1988) (statutory predecessor to section 552.117 of the Government Code not applicable to cellular telephone numbers provided and paid for by governmental body and intended for official use). Whether a particular piece of information is protected by section 552.117(a)(1) must be determined at the time the request for it is made. *See Open Records Decision No. 530* at 5 (1989). Therefore, a governmental body must withhold information under section 552.117(a)(1) on behalf of a current or former employee only if the individual made a request for confidentiality under section 552.024 prior to the date on which the request for the information was made. Accordingly, to the extent the employees whose cellular telephone numbers are at issue timely elected to keep their information confidential pursuant to section 552.024, and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the department must withhold the information you and we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1). The department may not withhold this information under section 552.117(a)(1) to the extent the employees did not timely elect to keep their information confidential or if the cellular telephone service is paid for by a governmental body.

Section 552.130 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure information related to a motor vehicle title or registration issued by an agency of this state or another state or country. See Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(2). Upon review, we conclude the department must withhold the discernible license plate numbers in the submitted photographs and videos under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code states “[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.” *Id.* § 552.136(b). Section 552.136(a) defines “access device” as “a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to . . . obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value [or] initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.” *Id.* § 552.136(a). Upon review, we conclude the department must withhold the bank account and bank routing numbers you and we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information appears to 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, to the extent the submitted information is identical to the information previously requested and ruled upon by this office in Open Records Letter No. 2012-13673, we conclude the department may rely on Open Records Letter No. 2012-13673 as a previous determination and withhold the identical responsive information in accordance with that ruling. To the extent the employees whose cellular telephone numbers are at issue timely elected to keep their information confidential pursuant to section 552.024 of the Government Code, and the cellular telephone service is not paid for by a governmental body, the department must withhold the information you and we have marked under section 552.117(a)(1) of the Government Code. The department must withhold the discernible license plate numbers in the submitted photographs and videos under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The department must withhold the bank account and bank routing numbers you and we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The department must release the remaining information; however, any information subject to copyright only may 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,



Sean Nottingham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SN/bhf

Ref: ID# 476055

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)