



KEN PAXTON
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 7, 2019

Ms. Countess Dudley
Office of General Counsel
Texas Southern University
3100 Cleburne Avenue
Houston, Texas 77004

OR2019-31462

Dear Ms. Dudley:

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# 795840.

Texas Southern University (the “university”) received a request for information concerning request for quotations 717-18-727.¹ You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code. Additionally, you indicate release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of DIGARC, Kuali, and Leepfrog d/b/a CourseLeaf (“Leepfrog”). Accordingly, you state you notified these third parties of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue 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 Leepfrog. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the university’s procedural obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code when requesting a decision from this office under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body must submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy

¹ As the university has not submitted a copy of the written request for information, we take our description of the request from its brief.

of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e). You state the university received the request for information on August 26, 2019. However, as of the date of this letter, the university has not submitted for our review a copy of the written request for information. Consequently, we find the university failed to comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless there is a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (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). The university claims section 552.104 of the Government Code for the submitted information. Because the interest of third parties can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider whether a portion of the submitted information may be withheld on behalf of the third parties. However, we find you have failed to establish a compelling reason to address your claimed exception.

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 not received comments from any remaining third party explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any remaining third party 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 university may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest any remaining third party may have in the information.

Leapfrog generally asserts some of its information at issue is protected under section 552.104 of the Government Code. Section 552.104(a) excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." *Id.* § 552.104(a). A private third party may invoke this exception. *Boeing Co. v. Paxton*, 466 S.W.3d 831 (Tex. 2015). The "test under section 552.104 is whether knowing another bidder's [or competitor's information] would be an advantage, not whether it would be a decisive advantage." *Id.* at 841. For many years, this office concluded the terms of a contract and especially the pricing of a winning bidder are public and generally not excepted from disclosure. Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 8 (1990) (public

has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency), 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors), 494 (1988) (requiring balancing of public interest in disclosure with competitive injury to company); *see generally* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview, 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). However, now, pursuant to *Boeing*, section 552.104 is not limited to only ongoing competitive situations, and a third party need only show release of its competitively sensitive information would give an advantage to a competitor even after a contract is executed. *Boeing*, 466 S.W.3d at 831, 839. Upon review, however, we find Leepfrog has failed to demonstrate the release of the information at issue would give advantage to a competitor or bidder for purposes of section 552.104(a). Therefore, we conclude the university may not withhold any of Leepfrog's information at issue under section 552.104(a) 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, 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.² RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This

²The 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;

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, 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*.

Leepfrog generally asserts portions of its information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find LeepFrog has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of its information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find Leepfrog has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its information. *See ORD 402*. Therefore, the university may not withhold any of Leepfrog’s information at issue under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Leepfrog generally asserts portions of its information consist of commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. 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 ORD 514. See generally Dep’t of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act*

-
- (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).

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). In addition, the terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.022(a)(3); ORD 541 at 8. Upon review, we find Leepfrog has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would likely result from the release of any of its information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 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, and qualifications are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Therefore, the university may not withhold any of Leepfrog's information at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The university must release the submitted information.

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 <https://www.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open-government/members-public/what-expect-after-ruling-issued> or call the OAG's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Public Information Act may be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the OAG, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Kelly McWethy
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KM/rm

Ref: ID# 795840

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Third Party
(w/o enclosures)