



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

May 31, 2013

Ms. Elizabeth G. Neally  
Counsel for the Harlingen Consolidated Independent School District  
Walsh, Anderson, Gallegos, Green & Trevino, P.C.  
P.O. Box 460606  
San Antonio, Texas 78246

OR2013-09067

Dear Ms. Neally:

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# 488791.

The Harlingen Consolidated School District (the "district"), which you represent, received a request for the entire bid package submitted by Central Air and Heating Services, Inc. ("CAHS") for a specified project. Although you take no position regarding the public availability of the submitted information, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of CAHS. Accordingly, you provide documentation showing the district notified CAHS of the request for information and of its 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 received comments from an attorney for CAHS. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

CAHS raises section 552.101 of the Government Code, which 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 common-law privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person and (2) 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 demonstrated. *See id.* at 681-82. We note common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals, not those of business and governmental 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). Upon review, we find CAHS has failed to demonstrate any of its information is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of CAHS's information under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Next, CAHS raises section 552.104 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104(a). This exception protects the competitive interests of governmental bodies, not the proprietary interests of private parties such as CAHS. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8 (1991) (discussing statutory predecessor). In this instance, the district did not claim an exception to disclosure under section 552.104. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Next, CAHS claims some of its 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(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. *See 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. *See* 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* Open Records Decision No. 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).

Upon review, we find CAHS has demonstrated that release of its customer information, which we have marked, constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive injury. Therefore, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find that CAHS has made only conclusory allegations that the release of its remaining information would result in substantial damage to the company’s

---

<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).

competitive position. Thus, CAHS has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of its remaining 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). We note the pricing information of a government contractor is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b) because we believe the public has a strong interest in the release of prices charged by a government contractor. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors), 319 at 3 (information relating to pricing is not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). *See generally* Dep't of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-345 (2009) (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 CAHS's remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

Upon review, we find CAHS has failed to demonstrate that any of its remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has CAHS demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. *See* ORD 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). Thus, none of CAHS's remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

We note the submitted information contains information subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.<sup>2</sup> Section 552.136 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.” Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see also id.* § 552.136(a) (“defining access device”). Accordingly, we find the district must withhold the bank account numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the district must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.110 and 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released.


---

<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).

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,



Nneka Kanu  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

NK/bhf

Ref: ID# 488791

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Central Air & Heating Service  
Mr. Jason R. Mann  
Jason R. Mann & Associates  
1309 North Stuart Place Road  
Harlingen, Texas 78552  
(w/o enclosures)