



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 10, 2004

Ms. Patrice Fogarty
City Secretary
City of Missouri City
P.O. Box 666
Missouri City, Texas 77459-0666

OR2004-1817

Dear Ms. Fogarty:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 197421.

The City of Missouri City (the "city") received a request for a copy of the responses and tabulation results for a specified Request for Proposal, excluding the requestor's own information. You claim that a portion of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.119 of the Government Code. You further state, and provide documentation showing, that you have notified ImageWare Systems, Inc. ("ImageWare") and i/t information technology solutions, inc. ("I/t"), the third parties whose information is at issue in the current request, pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Public Information Act ("Act") in certain circumstances). I/t has responded to the notice and argues that its information is excepted by section 552.110 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exceptions and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that 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 requested information relating to that party should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, ImageWare has not submitted to this office its reasons explaining why the requested information relating to

it should not be released. Consequently, ImageWare has provided this office with no basis to conclude that its responsive information is excepted from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). Accordingly, we conclude that the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information relating to ImageWare on the basis of any third party proprietary interest.

We now address I/t's contention that its information is excepted from disclosure by 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. Section 552.110(a) protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a). A "trade secret"

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] 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, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees.... A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, 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 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;

- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others 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 to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and
- (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 No. 232 (1979). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is exempted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990). 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. Gov’t Code § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

Based on our review of I/t’s arguments, we conclude that I/t has not established a *prima facie* case for trade secret with regard to the submitted information and may not withhold it under section 552.110(a). Furthermore, I/t has failed to demonstrate that release of the submitted information would result in its substantial competitive harm for purposes of section 552.110(b). Therefore, I/t’s information may not be withheld under section 552.110.

We note, however, that the submitted information contains information that is 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. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

We now turn to the city's argument under section 552.119 of the Government Code. Section 552.119 provides:

(a) A photograph that depicts a peace officer as defined by Article 2.12, Code of Criminal Procedure, or a security officer commissioned under Section 51.212, Education Code, the release of which would endanger the life or physical safety of the officer, is excepted from [required public disclosure] unless:

- (1) the officer is under indictment or charged with an offense by information;
- (2) the officer is a party in a fire or police civil service hearing or a case in arbitration; or
- (3) the photograph is introduced as evidence in a judicial proceeding.

(b) A photograph exempt from disclosure under Subsection (a) may be made public only if the peace officer or security officer gives written consent to the disclosure.

Gov't Code § 552.119. Under section 552.119, a governmental body must demonstrate, if the documents do not demonstrate on their face, that release of the photograph would endanger the life or physical safety of a peace officer.¹ Furthermore, a photograph of a peace officer cannot be withheld under section 552.119 if (1) the officer is under indictment or charged with an offense by information; (2) the officer is a party in a fire or police civil service hearing or a case in arbitration; (3) the photograph is introduced as evidence in a judicial proceeding; or (4) the officer gives written consent to the disclosure.

In this instance, you have not demonstrated, nor is it apparent from our review of the submitted information, that release of the photograph at issue would endanger the life or physical safety of the peace officer depicted. We therefore determine that the city may not withhold the photograph of the officer pursuant to section 552.119 of the Government Code.

¹"Peace officer" is defined by article 2.12 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

In summary, the city must release the submitted information in its entirety. The information that is protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with federal copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Jennifer E. Berry
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JEB/sdk

Ref: ID# 197421

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Mr. Richard Thai
Dynamic Imaging Systems, Inc.
2 Eyes Drive, Suite 200
Marlton, New Jersey 08053-3193
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Ott
Information Technology Solutions, Inc.
26415 212th Avenue
Delhi, Iowa 52223
(w/o enclosures)