



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
G R E G A B B O T T

June 20, 2005

Ms. Cynthia J. Kreider
Attorney
Department of Information Resources
P.O. Box 13564
Austin, Texas 78711-3564

OR2005-05416

Dear Ms. Kreider:

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# 226616.

The Department of Information Resources (the "department") received a request from a representative of Avaya, Inc. ("Avaya") for information pertaining to a department procurement of a "Voice Over Internet Protocol" system for the Capitol Complex Telephone System, including proposals and the awarded contract. You state that some of the requested documents "are being disclosed to the extent they exist and to the extent they are records of [the department]."¹ You do not take a position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act; however, you state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified the following companies of the department's receipt of the request for information and of the right of each to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestor: Avnet Enterprise Solutions ("Avnet"); EADS Telecom North America Inc. ("EADS"); Innovational IP Solutions ("Innovational"), LLC; InterNetwork Experts ("InterNetwork"), which was awarded the contract at issue; SBC DataComm ("SBC"); SIS Development Ltd. ("SIS"); Verizon Select Services, Inc. ("Verizon"); and Siemens. 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). EADS asserts that some of its information is excepted under sections 552.104 and 552.110 of the Government Code. We have considered EADS's arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

¹We note the Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist when the request for information was received. *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex.App.-San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986).

EADS asserts that Attachment 4 of its proposal is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which 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.² 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 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).

²The following are the six factors that the Restatement gives 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 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 [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(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).

After reviewing the information at issue and EADS’s arguments, we conclude that EADS has established that release of Attachment 4 would cause substantial competitive harm to EADS. Therefore, the department must withhold this information under section 552.110(b).³

Next, 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 it should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, neither Avnet, Innovational, InterNetwork, SBC, SIS, Verizon, nor Siemens has submitted to this office any reasons explaining why the requested information should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information constitutes proprietary information of these companies, and the department may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on that basis. *See* 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 (1990).

Finally, we note that 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. 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).

To conclude, the department must withhold Attachment 4 of EADS’s submitted proposal under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The department must release the

³As we are able to resolve this under section 552.110(b), we do not address EADS’s other arguments against exception of Attachment 4.

remaining information at issue, but any copyrighted information may only be released in accordance with 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, 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,


James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/seg

Ref: ID# 226616

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Cheryl McManus Bertzel
McGinnis, Lochridge & Kilgore, L.L.P.
919 Congress Avenue, Suite 1300
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Avaya, Inc.
ATTN: Ms. Debbie Tanner-Jacobs
Territory Client Executive
3606 John Simpson Trail
Austin, Texas 78732
(w/o enclosures)

Avnet Enterprise Solutions
ATTN: Mr. Michael Walter
Inside Sales Representative
1130 Rutherford Lane, Building 2, Suite 208
Austin, Texas 78753
(w/o enclosures)

EADS Telecom North America Inc.
ATTN: Ms. Marsha Propes
Account Manager
2811 Internet Boulevard
Frisco, Texas 75034-1851
(w/o enclosures)

Innovational IP Solutions, LLC
ATTN: Mr. Darrin Johnson
Project Manager
P.O. Box 983
Bothwell, Washington 98011
(w/o enclosures)

InterNetwork Experts
ATTN: Mr. Brent Blaha
Account Executive
8601 RR 2222, Building 1, Suite 100
Austin, Texas 78730
(w/o enclosures)

SBC DataComm
ATTN: Mr. William F. Penak
Global Account Director
712 East Huntland Drive, Room 230
Austin, Texas 78752
(w/o enclosures)

SIS Development Ltd.
ATTN: Mr. Randy Bourland
State & Local Government Accounts Manager
323 Congress Avenue, Suite 150
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Verizon Select Services, Inc.
ATTN: Ms. Colleen Parker
Corporate Account Manger
1700 North Austin Avenue
Georgetown, Texas 78626
(w/o enclosures)

Siemens
ATTN: Mr. Steve Vitale
Business Solutions Representative
11921 North MoPac Expressway, Suite 120
Austin, Texas 78759
(w/o enclosures)