



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 19, 2008

Ms. Lydia L. Perry
Law Offices of Robert E. Luna, P.C.
4411 North Central Expressway
Dallas, Texas 75205

OR2008-04936A

Dear Ms. Perry:

This office issued Open Records Letter No. 2008-04936 (2008) on April 14, 2008. In this ruling, we ruled that the Region 10 Education Service Center (the "center") did not submit all of the requested information related to Prologic Technology Systems, Inc. ("Prologic"). You have provided us with the additional information related to Prologic. Based on this new information, we determine that Open Records Letter No. 2008-04936 is incorrect. Where this office determines that an error was made in the decision process under sections 552.301 and 552.306, and that error resulted in an incorrect decision, we will correct the previously issued ruling. Consequently, this decision serves as the correct ruling and is a substitute for Open Records Letter No. 2008-04936. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.011 (providing that Office of the Attorney General may issue a decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of the Public Information Act (the "Act"))).

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Act, chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 308629A.

The center, which you represent, received a request for two specified proposals, the awarded contract, and any and all evaluation documents related to a specified RFP.¹ You state that the center has not yet awarded a contract, thus, you do not have information responsive to

¹We note that the center received clarification regarding this request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information).

that portion of the request.² You also state that you have released some of the requested information to the requestor. Although you take no position with respect to the remaining information, you indicate that it may contain proprietary information. You state, and provide documentation showing, that you have notified Prologic and SunGard Bi-tech ("SunGard") of the request and of their opportunity to submit comments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestor. *See id.* § 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 the applicability of exception to disclose under Act in certain circumstances). Representatives from SunGard and Prologic have submitted comments to our office. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that a portion of the submitted information is not responsive to the request because it pertains to companies other than Prologic and SunGard. We have marked the non-responsive information. This ruling does not address the public availability of any information that is not responsive to the request and the center is not required to release that information in response to the request.

Prologic and SunGard both raise section 552.110 of the Government Code for portions of the information related to them. Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets 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. 1957); *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.

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

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.³ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* ORD 552 at 5. 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. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). We also note that pricing information pertaining to a particular contract is generally not a trade secret because it is "simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business," rather than "a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business." RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *see Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982).

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* 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 submitted information and the arguments of Prologic and SunGard, we find that SunGard has made a *prima facie* case that some of its client information is protected as trade secret information. We note, however, that SunGard publishes the identities of some of its current and past clients on its website. In light of SunGard's own publication of such information, we cannot conclude that the identities of these clients qualify as trade secrets. Furthermore, we determine that Prologic and SunGard have failed to demonstrate that any portion of the remaining submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have they demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Accordingly, the center must only withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. We determine that no portion of

³The 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).

the remaining submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Prologic and SunGard also raise section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, we determine that release of SunGard's pricing information, which we have marked, would cause it substantial competitive harm and must be withheld under section 552.110(b). However, we find that Prologic and SunGard have not demonstrated that any portion of the remaining information is excepted under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Record Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (business entity must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 319 at 3 (1982) (information relating to organization, personnel, and qualifications not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). We therefore conclude that the center must only withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note that the remaining information contains insurance policy numbers.⁴ Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides:

(a) In this section, "access device" means a card, plate, code, account number, personal identification number, electronic serial number, mobile identification number, or other telecommunications service, equipment, or instrument identifier or means of account access that alone or in conjunction with another access device may be used to:

- (1) obtain money, goods, services, or another thing of value; or
- (2) initiate a transfer of funds other than a transfer originated solely by paper instrument.

(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.

Gov't Code § 552.136. We have marked the insurance policy numbers that must be withheld under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We also note that some of the submitted information appears to 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).

⁴The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (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).

In summary, the center must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code and the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released to the requestor, but any information protected by copyright must 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,



Jordan Johnson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JJ/jb

Ref: ID# 308629A

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. David R. Carll
Tyler Technologies, Inc.
370 U.S. Route One
Falmouth, Maine 04105
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Matt Chavez
SunGard Bi-Tech, L.L.C.
890 Fortress Street
Chico, California 95973
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jim Pepper
Prologic Technology Systems, Inc.
960 North Mopac Expressway, Suite 300
Austin, Texas 78759
(w/o enclosures)