



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 21, 2006

Mr. David K. Walker
County Attorney
Montgomery County Attorney's Office
207 West Phillips, 1st Floor
Conroe, Texas 77301

OR2006-02757

Dear Mr. Walker:

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# 243642.

The Montgomery County Purchasing Department (the "department") received a request for all bids and supporting documents related to Project #2005-0019. You state that you have released some of the requested information. You claim, however, that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.104, and 552.110 of the Government Code. You also state that the release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of third party Cogent Systems, Inc. ("Cogent"). Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, that you notified Cogent of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why its information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* 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). We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. However, the department does not cite to any specific law, nor are we aware of any, that makes any portion of the submitted information confidential under section 552.101. Therefore, we conclude that the department may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101.

Next, you assert that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code, which protects from required public disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104. The purpose of this exception is to protect the interests of a governmental body in competitive bidding situations. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). This exception protects information from public disclosure if the governmental body demonstrates potential specific harm to its interests in a particular competitive situation. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 593 at 2 (1991), 463 (1987), 453 at 3 (1986). A general allegation or a remote possibility of an advantage being gained is not enough to invoke the protection of section 552.104. Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 4 (1990), 520 at 4 (1989), 463 at 2 (1987). Generally, section 552.104 does not except bids from public disclosure after bidding is completed and the contract has been awarded. *See* Open Records Decision 541 (1990). In this case, you argue that disclosure of the submitted information would give the requestor "an unfair advantage" by "allow[ing] him to produce similar products and charge a lower fee, which would put Cogent . . . at a disadvantage." You do not claim, however, that release of this information would harm the *department's* interests in any particular competitive bidding situation. *See* ORD 463. Accordingly, we conclude that the department may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.104.

The department also claims that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. By its terms, section 552.110 only protects the interests of the person from whom the information was obtained. This provision does not protect the interests of the governmental body that receives proprietary information, nor does it allow a governmental body to assert section 552.110 for information it creates. However, a governmental body may assert section 552.110 on behalf of an interested third party. Therefore, we will address the department's claim on behalf of Cogent.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects the proprietary interests of private persons by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (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 the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See id.* § 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).

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. 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.¹ 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. *Id.* § 552.110(b); *see also Nat’l Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999) (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue).

¹There 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).

Upon review of your arguments on behalf of Cogent, we find that you have not established a trade secret claim. We therefore determine that none of the submitted information may be withheld under section 552.110(a). We also find that you have only provided conclusory assertions that release of the submitted information would harm Cogent's competitive interests, and have not provided specific factual evidence to substantiate the claim that release of the information at issue would result in competitive harm to Cogent. Accordingly, we determine that the submitted information may not be withheld under section 552.110(b). See ORD 661.

Finally, we note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of a governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) of the Government Code 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)(3). As of the date of this letter, Cogent has not submitted comments to this office explaining why any portion of the submitted information should not be released to the requestor. Thus, Cogent has not provided any basis to conclude that the release of any portion of the submitted information would implicate its proprietary interests. See Gov't Code § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm). Accordingly, we conclude that the department may not withhold any portion of the submitted information based on the proprietary interests of Cogent. Therefore, the submitted 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. 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,



Caroline E. Cho
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CEC/sdk

Ref: ID# 243642

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. James F. Kearney
SPEX Forensics
3880 Park Avenue
Edison, New Jersey 08820
(w/o enclosures)

Cogent Systems
209 Fair Oaks Avenue
South Pasadena, California 91030
(w/o enclosures)