



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 4, 2005

Mr. Rashaad V. Gambrell
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P. O. Box 1652
Houston, Texas 77002

OR2005-08990

Dear Mr. Gambrell:

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# 233444.

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for the record layout for the city's complete fleet maintenance system database, including all tables and all fields of information kept in this data set. Although you make no arguments and take no position as to whether the requested information is excepted from disclosure, pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you notified Maximus, Inc. ("Maximus") of the request and of its opportunity to submit comments to this office. 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 to disclosure in certain circumstances). In correspondence with this office, Maximus asserts that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. We have considered the claimed exception and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by a representative of the requestor. See Gov't Code § 552.304 (providing that interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we note, and you acknowledge, that the city has not complied with the statutory deadlines prescribed by section 552.301 of the Government Code in seeking an open records decision from this office. When a governmental body fails to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301, the information at issue is presumed public and must be released unless a compelling reason exists for withholding the information from disclosure. See Gov't Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *City of Houston v. Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co.*, 673 S.W.2d 316, 323 (Tex. App.—Houston [1st Dist.] 1984, no writ); Open Records Decision

No. 319 (1982). A compelling reason for withholding information is demonstrated where information is made confidential by other law or where third party interests are at issue. Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). In this instance, because you contend that the requested information involves third party interests, we will consider Maximus' claims for non-disclosure.

Maximus claims portions of the requested information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects a "trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.110(a). 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.), cert. denied, 358 U.S. 898 (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). 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. RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939).¹ 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

¹The six factors that the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret are:

- (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).

claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990). Although Maximus asserts that its information is a trade secret, Maximus neither explains how the information at issue meets the definition of trade secret nor discusses the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. Thus none of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a). As Maximus claims no other exceptions to disclosure, the requested information must be released to the requestor.

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); *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 Office of the Attorney General 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'J. Vela III', with a stylized flourish at the end.

José Vela III
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JV/krl

Ref: ID# 233444

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mark Greenblatt
KHOU-TV
1945 Allen Parkway
Houston, Texas 77019
(w/o enclosures)

David R. Francis
General Counsel
Maximus, Inc.
11419 Sunset Hills Road
Reston, Virginia 20190
(w/o enclosures)