



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

February 5, 2007

Ms. Cynthia Villarreal-Reyna  
Section Chief, Agency Counsel  
Legal and Compliance Division  
Texas Department of Insurance  
P.O. Box 149104  
Austin, Texas 78714-9104

OR2007-01430

Dear Ms. Villarreal-Reyna:

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# 270651.

The Texas Department of Insurance (the "department") received a request for the 2005 viatical reports of Coventry First LLC and Coventry First of Texas LLC (collectively, "Coventry") and Peachtree Life Settlements ("Peachtree"). You do not take a position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act; however, Coventry and Peachtree, in correspondence to this office, assert that the submitted information is excepted under sections 552.101, 552.104, and 552.110 of the Government Code. *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). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See Gov't Code* § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

We initially note that information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information to a governmental body anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). Thus, a governmental body cannot, through an agreement or contract, overrule or repeal

provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract.”), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Consequently, unless the requested information falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectations or agreement specifying otherwise.

We next note that the department acknowledges that it failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code. A governmental body’s failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). The presumption that information is public under section 552.302 can generally be overcome by demonstrating that the information is confidential by law or third-party interests are at stake. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 630 at 3 (1994), 325 at 2 (1982). The interests of Coventry and Peachtree are at stake; therefore, we will address the arguments of these interested third parties for exception of the submitted information.

Coventry and Peachtree assert that the submitted information is excepted under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision.” This section encompasses information protected by other statutes. The submitted documents contain information that Coventry and Peachtree provided to the department pursuant to section 3.1705 of title 28 of the Texas Administrative Code. *See* 28 T.A.C. § 3.1705 (identifying information of viatical providers and brokers as well as viatical settlement agreement information must be submitted to department); *see also* Ins. Code § 1111.003(a) (department commissioner shall adopt reasonable rules relating to life settlements and relating to viatical settlements). Peachtree and Coventry assert that this information is confidential under section 3.1714, which provides in relevant part as follows:

All confidential information solicited or obtained by a viatical or life settlement provider, provider representative, or broker about a viator, life settlor or owner, including the viator’s, life settlor’s, or owner’s identity or the identity of family members, a spouse or a significant other, is confidential and shall not be disclosed in any form to any person.

28 T.A.C. § 3.1714; *see also* Ins. Code § 1111.003(b)(7) (rules adopted by department commissioner must include rules governing maintenance of appropriate confidentiality of personal and medical information). The submitted information does not contain identifying information about viators, life settlors, or owners or their family members, spouses, or

significant others; therefore, we conclude that the submitted information is not confidential under section 3.1714 of title 28 of the Texas Administrative Code, and the department may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code on that ground.

Peachtree argues that its information is excepted under section 552.104 of the Government Code. We note that section 552.104 is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions that are intended to protect the interests of third parties. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 592 (1991) (statutory predecessor to section 552.104 designed to protect interests of a governmental body in a competitive situation, and not interests of private parties submitting information to the government), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). As the department does not seek to withhold any information pursuant to section 552.104, we find this section does not apply to the submitted information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991) (governmental body may waive section 552.104). Therefore, the department may not withhold any of the information at issue pursuant to section 552.104.

Coventry and Peachtree also assert that the submitted information 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.<sup>1</sup> 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).

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).

We find Coventry and Peachtree have established that the release of some of the information at issue, including broker information and the “Net Amount Paid to Owner” columns, would cause substantial competitive injury to these companies; therefore, the department must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b). We find that Coventry and Peachtree have made only conclusory allegations that release of the remaining information at issue would cause either company substantial competitive injury, and have provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. In addition, we conclude that Coventry and Peachtree have failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any of the remaining information is a trade secret. See Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). Thus, the department may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110, but instead must release the remaining information 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.

---

<sup>1</sup>The 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).

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,

  
James L. Coggeshall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JLC/jww

Ref: ID# 270651

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Rose Ann Santoro  
Greenwich Life Settlements, Inc.  
115 East Putnam Avenue, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Greenwich, Connecticut 06830  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Craig M. Lessner  
Life Settlement Corporation  
d/b/a Peachtree Life Settlements  
3301 Quantum Boulevard, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Boynton Beach, Florida 33426-8669  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Alex Lempiner  
Senior Vice President and Assistant General Counsel  
Coventry  
7111 Valley Green Road  
Fort Washington, Pennsylvania 19034-2209  
(w/o enclosures)