



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

This ruling has been modified by court action.
The ruling and judgment can be viewed in PDF
format below.



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

June 5, 2015

Mr. Jeffery Giles
Ms. Nneka Kanu
Ms. Danielle Folsom
Assistant City Attorneys
City of Houston
Legal Department
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

The ruling you have requested has been amended as a result of litigation and has been attached to this document.

OR2015-11107

Dear Mr. Giles, Ms. Kanu, and Ms. Folsom:

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# 564382 (GC Nos. 22140, 22195, 22235, 22242, and 22299).

The City of Houston (the "city") received five requests for information pertaining to specified requests for proposals for the city's airports. You state the city has released some information. You take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act.¹ However, you state release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of 4 Families of IAH, L.L.C. ("4 Families"); ATU Americas, L.L.C. ("ATU"); Creative Food Group, L.L.C. ("Creative"); Delaware North Companies Travel

¹Although the city initially raised section 552.104 of the Government Code for the submitted information, you inform this office the city has withdrawn its claim under this exception. See Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

Hospitality Service, Inc. (“Delaware”); Dufry NA IAH JV HG (“Dufry”); Duty Free Americas Houston, L.L.C. (“DFAH”); H Town Coffee House Joint Venture (“H Town”); HG Houston Retailers JV (“HG”); Hojeij Branded Foods, Inc. (“HBF”); Host International, Inc. (“Host”); JDDA Houston 14, L.L.C. (“JDDA”); LaTrelle’s Galley, L.P. (“LaTrelle’s”); MRG Houston (JV), L.L.C. (“MRG”); Paradies-Houston 2014, L.L.C. (“Paradies”); Prestige Duty Free Houston, L.L.C. (“Prestige”); SSP America, Inc. (“SSP”); Sun IAH Airport Concessions, L.L.C. (“Sun”); Travel Retail Group Houston, L.L.C. (“Travel”); and WDFG North America, L.L.C. (“WDFG”). Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified these third parties of the request for information and of the right of each 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 4 Families, ATU, Creative, Delaware, DFAH, H Town, HBF, LaTrelle’s, Paradies, Prestige, Travel, and WDFG. We have reviewed the submitted information and the submitted arguments.

Initially, we note some of the submitted information, which we have indicated, was the subject of a previous ruling by this office. In Open Records Letter No. 2015-09218 (2015), we concluded the city must (1) withhold the tax return information we marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code, (2) withhold the information we marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code, (3) withhold the routing, bank account, and insurance policy numbers we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code, and (4) release the remaining responsive information in accordance with copyright law. We have no indication the law, facts, or circumstances upon which the prior ruling was based have changed. Accordingly, the city must continue to rely on Open Records Letter No. 2015-09218 as a previous determination, and withhold or release this information in accordance with that ruling.² *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 a prior attorney general ruling, ruling is addressed to same governmental body, and ruling concludes that information is or is not excepted from disclosure). However, we will address your arguments for the remaining information, which was not previously ruled on by this office.

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) of the Government Code 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 not received comments from Dufry, HG, Host, JDDA, MRG, SSP, or Sun explaining

²As we are able to make this determination, we need not address the submitted arguments pertaining to this information.

why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of these third parties has a protected proprietary interest 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 city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest these third parties may have in the information.

LaTrelle and Travel argue their information was supplied to the city with the expectation the confidentiality of the information would be maintained. However, information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *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. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to 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 Gov’t Code § 552.110). Consequently, unless the information falls within an exception to disclosure, the city must release it, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

LaTrelle, Paradies, and Prestige raise section 552.104 of the Government Code for their information. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104. We note section 552.104 protects the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 at 8 (1991) (purpose of section 552.104 is to protect governmental body’s interest in competitive bidding situation). As the city does not argue section 552.104 is applicable, we will not consider Latrelle’s, Paradies’s, or Prestige’s claims under this section. *See id.* (section 552.104 may be waived by governmental body). Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.104 of the Government Code.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.”³ Gov’t Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. Prior decisions of this office have held section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code renders federal tax return information confidential. *See* Attorney General Opinion

³The Office of the Attorney General will raise mandatory exceptions on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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 Treasury] 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[.]” See 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 tax return information, which we have marked, 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.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses the doctrine of 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 satisfied. *Id.* at 681-82. Types of information considered intimate and embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court are delineated in *Industrial Foundation*. *Id.* at 683. This office has also found personal financial information not relating to a financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body is generally excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. We note that 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). Upon review, we find some of the remaining information, which we have marked, satisfies the standard articulated by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation*. Accordingly, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. However, we find the remaining information is not highly intimate or embarrassing information or is of legitimate public interest. Therefore, none of the remaining information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

We note LaTrelle raises section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 252.049 of the Local Government Code, which provides as follows:

(a) Trade secrets and confidential information in competitive sealed bids are not open for public inspection.

(b) If provided in a request for proposals, proposals shall be opened in a manner that avoids disclosure of the contents to competing offerors and keeps the proposals secret during negotiations. All proposals are open for public inspection after the contract is awarded, but trade secrets and confidential information in the proposals are not open for public inspection.

Local Gov't Code § 252.049. This provision merely duplicates the protection section 552.110 of the Government Code provides to trade secret and commercial or financial information. Therefore, we will address LaTrelle's arguments with respect to section 252.049 of the Local Government Code under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

4 Families, ATU, Creative, Delaware, DFAH, H Town, HBF, LaTrelle, Paradies, Prestige, and Travel each argue portions of their information are 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:

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.⁴ 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 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).

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.

ATU, Delaware, H Town, HBF, LaTrelle, Paradies, Prestige, and Travel each argue portions of their information consist of commercial information the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find ATU, Delaware, HBF, LaTrelle, and Paradies have each demonstrated portions of the information at issue constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive injury. Accordingly, the city must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.⁵ However, we find ATU, Delaware, H Town, HBF, LaTrelle, Paradies,

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

⁵As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address any remaining arguments for this information.

Prestige, and Travel have failed to demonstrate the release of any of the remaining information would result in substantial harm to the companies' 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 is 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). Furthermore, we note this office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest; thus, the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). 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 344-345 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Further, the terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. See Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Further, 4 Families, ATU, Creative, Delaware, DFAH, H Town, HBF, LaTrelle, Paradies, and Prestige each argue portions of their information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find Creative and LaTrelle have established a *prima facie* case that their customer information constitutes trade secret information. Therefore, the customer information at issue must generally be withheld under section 552.110(a). However, to the extent any of the customer information at issue has been published on either company's website, such information is not confidential under section 552.110(a), and the city may not withhold it on that basis. Additionally, we conclude 4 Families, ATU, Creative, Delaware, DFAH, H Town, HBF, LaTrelle, Paradies, and Prestige have failed to demonstrate any of the remaining information constitutes trade secret information for purposes of section 552.110(a). See ORD 402. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, "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 insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136.

Accordingly, the city must withhold the routing, bank account, and insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the materials 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 city must withhold the submitted tax return information, which we marked, under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 6103(a) of title 26 of the United States Code. The city must withhold the information we marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The city must withhold Creative's and LaTrelle's customer information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code; however, to the extent any of the customer information at issue has been published on either company's website, such information may not be withheld under section 552.110(a). The city must withhold the routing, bank account, and insurance policy numbers we marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining responsive information; however, any information that is subject to copyright may be released only 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, 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,



Sean Nottingham
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SN/cbz

Ref: ID# 564382

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 5 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Taney
General Counsel
Duty Free Americas Houston, LLC
6100 Hollywood Boulevard, 7th Floor
Hollywood, Florida 33024
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Mary F. Keller
Counsel for Delaware North Companies
Travel Hospitality Services
Winstead
401 Congress Avenue, Suite 2100
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jonathan Potash
President
Travel Retail Group Houston, LLC
555 Northeast 185th Street
Miami Gardens, Florida 33179
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Tracy H. Lautenschlager
Counsel for The Paradies Shops, LLC
Greenberg Traurig, P.A.
401 East Las Olas Boulevard
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Padraig D. Drennan
President
World Duty Free Group
6905 Rockledge Drive
Bethesda, Maryland 20817
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Anthony R. Chase
CEO
H Town Coffee House
3311 West Alabama
Houston, Texas 77098
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David J. Goodman
Counsel for Hojeij Branded Foods, Inc.
Bourland, Wall & Wenzel, P.C.
301 Commerce Street, Suite 1500
Fort Worth, Texas 76102-4115
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Doreen M. Edelman
Counsel for ATU Americas, LLC
Baker Donelson Bearman, Caldwell &
Berkowitz, PC
920 Massachusetts Ave Northwest, Ste 900
Washington, D.C. 20001
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Ruth Van Meter
Counsel for LaTrelle's Galley, LP
Hall
4265 San Felipe Street, Suite 1100
Houston, Texas 77027
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Karen K. Suttle
Vice President & General Counsel
Paradies
2849 Paces Ferry Road, 4th Floor
Atlanta, Georgia 30339
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Altaf Isani
President and CEO
Creative Food Group, LLC
One Penn Plaza, Suite 1612
New York, New York 10119
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Christopher J. Pappas
Manager
4 Families of IAH, LLC
13939 Northwest Freeway
Houston, Texas 77040
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mario F. Cediell
Vice President
JDDA Houston 14, LLC
P.O. Box 60496
Houston, Texas 77365
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John Bulger
Assistant Secretary
Prestige Duty Free Houston, LLC
211 East 7th Street, Suite 620
Austin, Texas 78701-3218
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Guillermo Perales
CEO & Manager
Sun IAH Airport Concessions, LLC
111 FM 1960 Road Northwest
Houston, Texas 77090
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Roger Worrell
CEO
SSP America, Inc.
19465 Deerfield Avenue, Suite 105
Landsowne, Virginia 20176
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael C. Wilkins
President & CEO
MRG Houston (JV), LLC
5385 Wynn Road
Las Vegas, Nevada 89118
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Anthony C. Alessi
Vice President Business Development
Host International, Inc.
6905 Rockledge Drive
Bethesda, Maryland 20817
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael R. Mullaney
Executive Vice President
HG Houston Retailers
One Meadowlands Plaza, 11th Floor
Easter Rutherford, New Jersey 07073
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kevin T. Kelly
President
Delaware North Companies Travel
Hospitality Service, Inc.
40 Fountain Plaza
Buffalo, New York 14202
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael R. Mullaney
Executive Vice President
Dufry NA IAH JV HG
One Meadowlands Plaza, 11th Floor
East Rutherford, New Jersey 07073
(w/o enclosures)


Mr. Ali Saglam
Vice President
ATU Americas, LLC
1050 17th Street Northwest, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20036
(w/o enclosures)

"B." None of the requestors have filed motions to intervene. After considering the agreement of the parties and the law, the Court is of the opinion that entry of an agreed final judgment is appropriate, disposing of all claims between these parties.

IT IS THEREFORE ADJUDGED, ORDERED AND DECLARED THAT:


1. ATU, the Attorney General, and the City have agreed that in accordance with the PIA and under the facts presented, portions of the information at issue, which is contained in a bid to Houston Airport System to provide concessions at George Bush International Airport, is excepted from disclosure pursuant to Texas Government Code section 552.104. Pursuant to Texas Government Code section 552.104, the City will redact the bid in conformity with the redactions proposed by ATU on February 28, 2017. These redaction will be in addition to the redactions required by Open Records Letter ruling OR2015-11107.
2. Attorney General Letter Rulings OR2015-11107 shall not be relied on as a previous determination.
3. All court costs and attorney fees are taxed against the parties incurring the same;
4. All relief not expressly granted is denied; and
5. This Agreed Final Judgment finally disposes of all claims that are the subject of this lawsuit between ATU, the Attorney General, and the City of Houston and is a final judgment.

SIGNED the 5 day of June, 2017.




PRESIDING JUDGE


AGREE.


KIMBERLY FUCHS
State Bar No. 24044140
Assistant Attorney General
Administrative Law Division
P. O. Box 12548, Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711-2548
Telephone: (512) 475-4195
Facsimile: (512) 320-0167
Email: kimberly.fuchs@oag.texas.gov

ATTORNEY FOR DEFENDANT, KEN PAXTON


EDDY DE LOS SANTOS
Texas Bar No. 24040790
KALI M. HYDE
Texas Bar No. 24083234
1301 McKinney Street
Suite 3700
Houston, Texas 77010
713-650-9700 – Telephone
713-650-9701 – Facsimile
edelossantos@bakerdonelson.com
khyde@bakerdonelson.com

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF ATU AMERICAS, LLC


DAVID L. RED
Texas Bar No. 16656900
Senior Assistant City Attorney
CITY OF HOUSTON LEGAL DEPARTMENT
P. O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001
Telephone: (832) 393-6293
Facsimile: (832) 393-6259

SENDER: COMPLETE THIS SECTION

COMPLETE THIS SECTION ON DELIVERY

- Complete items 1, 2, and 3. Also complete item 4 if Restricted Delivery is desired.
- Print your name and address on the reverse so that we can return the card to you.
- Attach this card to the back of the mailpiece, or on the front if space permits.

1. Article Addressed to:

Mr. Ted Oberg
 3310 Bissonnet St.
 Houston, TX 77005
 [ATU] [Req Ltr 1 re settlement]

A. Signature
 X *[Signature]* Agent Address...

B. Received by (Printed Name) **JOSE LEON** C. Date of Delivery **04/26/17**

D. Is delivery address different from item 1? Yes
 If YES, enter delivery address below: No

3. Service Type
 Certified Mail Express Mail
 Registered Return Receipt for Merchandise
 Insured Mail C.O.D.

4. Restricted Delivery? (Extra Fee) Yes

2. Article Number (Transfer from service lab) **7008 0500 0001 5066 2246**

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE



First-Class Mail
 Postage & Fees Paid
 USPS
 Permit No. G-10

17
 25 APR 17
 5471

• Sender: Please print your name, address, and ZIP+4 in this box •

[ATU] [Req Ltr 1 re settlement]

Kimberly Fuchs, Open Records Litigation
 Office of Attorney General, ALD - 018
 P O BOX 12548 CAPITOL STATION
 AUSTIN TX 78711-2548

1-254848

A

CAUSE NO. D-1-GN-15-002900

ATU AMERICAS, LLC.

Plaintiff,

v.

**KEN PAXTON, ATTORNEY GENERAL
OF TEXAS, and THE CITY OF
HOUSTON**

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF

TRAVIS COUNTY, TEXAS

53RD JUDICIAL DISTRICT

SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT

This Settlement Agreement (Agreement) is made by and between ATU Americas, LLC ("ATU"), Ken Paxton, Attorney General of Texas ("the Attorney General"), and the City of Houston ("the City"). This Agreement is made on the terms set forth below.

Background

This case is a challenge to Open Records Letter ruling OR2015-11107. ATU disputed the rulings as they apply ATU's information, and filed the above-styled lawsuit to preserve its rights under the Public Information Act ("PIA").

ATU submitted information and briefing to the Attorney General establishing that some of its information is excepted from disclosure under Texas Government Code section 552.104. The City and the Attorney General agree to the settlement.

Texas Government Code section 552.325(c) allows the Attorney General to enter into a settlement pursuant to which the information at issue in this lawsuit may be withheld. The parties wish to resolve this matter without further litigation.

Terms

For good and sufficient consideration, the receipt of which is acknowledged, the parties to this Agreement agree and stipulate that:

1. ATU, the Attorney General, and the City have agreed that in accordance with the PIA and under the facts presented, portions of the information at issue, which is contained in a bid to Houston Airport System to provide concessions at George Bush International Airport, is excepted from disclosure pursuant to Texas Government Code section 552.104. Pursuant to Texas Government Code section 552.104, the City will redact the bid in conformity with the redactions proposed by ATU on February 28, 2017. These redactions will be in addition to the redactions required by Open Records Letter ruling OR2015-11107.
2. ATU, the City, and the Attorney General agree to the entry of an agreed final judgment, the form of which has been approved by each party's attorney. The agreed final judgment will be presented to the court for approval, on the uncontested docket, with at least 15 days prior notice to the requestors.
3. The Attorney General agrees that he will also notify the requestors, as required by Tex. Gov't Code § 552.325(c), of the proposed settlement and of their rights to intervene to contest ATU's right to have the City withhold the information.
4. A final judgment entered in this lawsuit after a requestor intervenes prevails over this Agreement to the extent of any conflict.
5. Each party to this Agreement will bear their own costs, including attorney fees relating to this litigation.
6. The terms of this Agreement are contractual and not mere recitals, and the agreements contained herein and the mutual consideration transferred is to

compromise disputed claims fully, and nothing in this Agreement shall be construed as an admission of fault or liability, all fault and liability being expressly denied by all parties to this Agreement.

7. ATU warrants that its undersigned representative is duly authorized to execute this Agreement on its behalf and that its representative has read this Agreement and fully understands it to be a compromise and settlement and release of all claims that ATU has against the Attorney General and/or the City arising out of the matters described in this Agreement.

8. The Attorney General warrants that his undersigned representative is duly authorized to execute this Agreement on behalf of the Attorney General and his representative has read this Agreement and fully understands it to be a compromise and settlement and release of all claims that the Attorney General has against ATU and/or the City arising out of the matters described in this Agreement.

9. The City warrants that its undersigned representative is duly authorized to execute this Agreement on behalf of the City and its representative has read this Agreement and fully understands it to be a compromise and settlement and release of all claims that the City has against ATU and/or the Attorney General arising out of the matters described in this Agreement.

10. This Agreement shall become effective, and be deemed to have been executed, on the date on which the last of the undersigned parties sign this Agreement.

ATU AMERICAS, LLC.

By: 

name: Eddy De Los Santos
firm: Baker, Donelson, Bearman,
Caldwell, and ~~Berman~~, PC.
Berkowitz

Date: April 24, 2017


KEN PAXTON, ATTORNEY GENERAL
OF TEXAS

By: 

name: Kimberly Fuchs
title: Assistant Attorney General,
Administrative Law Division

Date: 4/24/17

CITY OF HOUSTON

By: 

name: David L. Red
title: Senior Assistant City Attorney

Date: 24 April 2017