



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 5, 2015

Ms. Cynthia Rincón  
General Counsel  
Department of Legal Services  
Fort Bend Independent School District  
16431 Lexington Boulevard  
Sugar Land, Texas 77479

OR2015-11089

Dear Ms. Rincón:

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# 566795 (ORR# 2014-15-750)

The Fort Bend Independent School District (the "district") received a request for all responses to a specified request for proposals. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Advanced Tracking Technologies, Inc.; GFI Systems USA, L.L.C.; Infratel Campus Security, Inc.; Longhorn Bus Sales; MotionLink; Sigma Surveillance, Inc.; Synovia Solutions, L.L.C.; T-Mobile USA, Inc.; Tyler Technologies ("Tyler"); and Zonar Systems, Inc. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the request for information and of their rights 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 Tyler. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the district did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e). Pursuant to section 552.302 of

the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption 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). Because third party interests can provide a compelling reason to withhold information, we will consider whether any of the submitted information must be withheld under the Act on that ground. In addition, we note the submitted information contains information subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> As this section makes information confidential under the Act, we will also consider its applicability to the submitted information.

Next, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See Gov't Code* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have only received comments from Tyler explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the other third parties have protected proprietary interests in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110; 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 district may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest any of the other third parties may have in it.

Tyler asserts some of its 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 of Torts, which holds a trade secret to be:

---

<sup>1</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. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 776 (Tex. 1958). 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>2</sup> 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 Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990)*. However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown 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)*. We 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 also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; *Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978)*.

---

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

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 (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 Tyler has demonstrated its pricing information is commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find Tyler has failed to demonstrate the release of its remaining information would cause the company substantial competitive injury, and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (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). Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of Tyler’s remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Further, we find Tyler has failed to demonstrate any of its remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret, and has failed to demonstrate the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983) (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). Consequently, none of Tyler’s remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code states “Notwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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 id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device number for the purposes of section 552.136. *See* Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009). Upon review, we find the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.


We note some of the remaining 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.

In summary, the district must withhold the pricing information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The district must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released; however, any copyrighted information 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](http://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml), 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Brian E. Berget  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

BB/akg

Ref: ID# 566795

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Abby Diaz  
Associate General Counsel  
Tyler Technologies  
One Tyler Drive  
Yarmouth, Maine 04096  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Vikas Jain  
Zonar  
18200 Cascade Avenue South  
Seattle, Washington 98188  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Matthew Millen  
T-Mobile USA  
12920 SE 38<sup>th</sup> Street  
Bellevue, Washington 98006  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bill Westerman  
Synovia Solutions  
9330 Priority Way West Drive  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46240  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Hoffman  
STS360-Sigma Surveillance  
1081 Ohio Drive, Suite 1  
Plano, Texas 75093  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dustin Koch  
MotionLink  
1201 West Peachtree Street, #3350  
Atlanta, Georgia 30309  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Trace Heider  
Longhorn Bus Sales  
6921 Homestead Road  
Houston, Texas 77028  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Wade  
Infratel Campus Security  
20931 Barbons Heath Court  
Katy, Texas 77449  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jadon Rempel  
GFI Systems USA, LLC  
5430 LBJ Freeway, Suite 1200  
Dallas, Texas 75240  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Paul Glass  
Advanced Tracking Technologies  
6001 Savoy Drive  
Houston, Texas 77036  
(w/o enclosures)