



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 9, 2009

Ms. Evelyn Njuguna
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2009-17389

Dear Ms. Njuguna:

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# 363773.

The City of Houston (the "city") received two requests for information pertaining to the Police Department Crime Lab System Request for Proposals No. S37-T22904 and the Municipal Court Management System Request for Qualifications Q23218. You state the city has released some of the information requested by the second requestor to him. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified McLane Advanced Technologies ("McLane"), JusticeTrax, Inc., Labware, Inc., Porter Lee Corporation, The Computer Solution Company of Virginia, Inc., and Wunderlich-Malec Systems of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. *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 received comments from McLane. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that you have not submitted for our review any information pertaining to the Municipal Court Management System Request for Qualifications Q23218.¹ Thus, to the extent information responsive to this aspect of the first request existed when the first request was received, we assume it has been released. If such information has not been released, then it must be released at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

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 information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, this office has not received comments from JusticeTrax, Inc., Labware, Inc., Porter Lee Corporation, The Computer Solution Company of Virginia, Inc., or Wunderlich-Malec Systems explaining why each third party's submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that these third parties have a protected proprietary interest in the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110; 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. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information based upon the proprietary interests of JusticeTrax, Inc., Labware, Inc., Porter Lee Corporation, The Computer Solution Company of Virginia, Inc., or Wunderlich-Malec Systems.

Next, we consider McLane's arguments against disclosure of its information under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects: (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. *Id.* § 552.110(a), (b). Section 552.110(a) protects the proprietary 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

¹We note you state that you have directed the first requestor to the city's Information Technology Department for the information responsive to her request for the Municipal Court Management System Request for Qualifications Q23218.

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).

There 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 the 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* ORD 232. This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted 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 at 2 (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. 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); ORD 661.

Having considered McLane’s arguments under section 552.110(a), we determine that McLane has failed to demonstrate that any portion of its submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. We 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 business,” rather than “a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business.” *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of McLane’s submitted information on the basis of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review of McLane’s arguments under section 552.110(b), we find that McLane has established that its pricing information, which we have marked, constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive injury. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find that McLane has made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of its remaining information would result in substantial damage to the company’s competitive position. Thus, McLane has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of its remaining information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (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), 509 at 5 (1988) (because costs, bid specifications, and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts is too speculative). Accordingly, none of McLane’s remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).


Finally, we note that some of the materials at issue are 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 protected by copyright. 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 materials protected by copyright, 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 city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but any information subject to copyright must be released in accordance with federal copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/eeg

Ref: ID# 363773

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Angela B. Styles
Crowell Moring
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, DC 20004-2595
(w/o enclosures)