



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 20, 2005

Mr. Scott A. Kelly
Deputy General Counsel
Texas A&M University System
200 Technology Way, Suite 2079
College Station, Texas 77845-3424

OR2005-03425

Dear Mr. Kelly:

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# 222459.

The Office of the Texas State Chemist (the "state chemist") received two requests for information related to correspondence pertaining Nutro Products, Inc. ("Nutra"). While the state chemist does not take a position with respect to the release of the requested information, it claims that this information may be subject to third party proprietary interests. Therefore, pursuant to section 552.305(d) of the Government Code, the state chemist notified Nutro of the state chemist's receipt of the requests and of Nutro's right to submit arguments to this office as to why any portion of the requested information should not be released to the requestors. *See Gov't Code § 552.305(d); see also Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exceptions to disclosure in certain circumstances).* Nutro provided this office with arguments against disclosure of some of the requested information. We have considered Nutro's arguments and have reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted on behalf of one requestor. *See Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).*

Nutra asserts that the information at issue is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by

excepting from disclosure two types of information: trade secrets and commercial or financial information the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. Section 552.110(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision.” The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1958); *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.¹ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must accept a private person’s claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that

¹The 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).

section 552.110(a) applies 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) excepts from disclosure “[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.” Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the requested information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Having considered Nutro’s arguments and reviewed the information at issue, we find that Nutro has made a *prima facie* case that the requested scientific information it seeks to withhold meets the definition of a trade secret, and we have received no arguments to rebut this claim as a matter of law. Accordingly, we conclude that the state chemist must withhold the submitted scientific information pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. We also find that Nutro has demonstrated that release of the submitted marketing information it seeks to withhold would cause the company harm and must be withheld pursuant to section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, the information Nutro seeks to withhold in a letter received from the state chemist must be released. Nutro has not submitted arguments that the remaining submitted letter from the state chemist is excepted from disclosure, thus, this letter must be released. We have marked the submitted information accordingly.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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); *Tex. 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,



Ramsey A. Abarca
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

RAA/jev

Ref: ID# 222459

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. D. Jeffrey Ireland
Faruki, Ireland & Cox, P.L.L.C.
500 Courthouse Plaza, SW
10 North Ludlow Street
Dayton, Ohio 45402
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Ann Marie T. Rizzo
Kirkland & Ellis, L.L.P.
200 East Randolph Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60601
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. William E. Wegner
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher, L.L.P.
333 South Grand Avenue
Los Angeles, California 90071-3197
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Richard Johnson
Blackwell Sanders Peper Martin L.L.P.
P.O. Box 419777
Kansas City, Missouri 64141-6777
(w/o enclosures)

Dr. Sharon Machlik, Ph.D.
Nutro Products, Inc.
445 Wilson Way
City of Industry, California 91744
(w/o enclosures)