



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 5, 2011

Ms. Ashleigh Dozier Wiswell  
Corporate Compliance Officer and  
Public Information Officer  
Moore County Hospital District  
224 East 2<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Dumas, Texas 79029

OR2011-04674

Dear Ms. Wiswell:

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# 413615.

The Moore County Hospital District (the "county") received a request for the contract between the county and Medical Information Technology, Inc. ("Meditech") and "all proposals from all bidders associated with this purchase." Although you raise no exceptions to disclosure of the submitted information, you indicate release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Thus, pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, the county has notified Cerner Corporation ("Cerner"); Healthcare Management Systems, Inc. ("HMS"); and Meditech of the request and their right to submit arguments to this office explaining why the submitted information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *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 in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Cerner, HMS, and Meditech. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, you inform us that the county asked for clarification regarding some of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 31 (1974). You inform us the county has not received a response from the requestor. We note a governmental body has a duty to make a good faith effort to relate a request for information to information that the governmental body holds. *See* Open Records Decision

No. 561 at 8-9 (1990). In this case, you state the county did not issue a formal request for proposals, but did obtain "quotes" from Cerner and HMS. Thus, you indicate that you do not maintain "proposals" from Cerner and HMS. You also state the county is unable to locate these two quotes. We note the Act does not require a governmental body to release information that did not exist when it received a request. *See Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 555 at 1 (1990), 452 at 3 (1986), 362 at 2 (1983). Thus, we will consider the submitted arguments for only the submitted information.

We note Cerner and HMS seek to withhold information the county has not submitted for our review. By statute, this office may only rule on the public availability of information submitted by the governmental body requesting the ruling. *See Gov't Code* § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested). Because the information Cerner and HMS seek to withhold was not submitted by the county, this ruling does not address Cerner's and HMS's arguments against its disclosure.

Next, we must address the county's obligations under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.301(e) of the Government Code, the governmental body is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving the request (1) general written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *See Gov't Code* § 552.301(e). You state the county received the present request for information on January 14, 2011. However, you did not submit a copy of the written request for information until February 9, 2011. Consequently, the county failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301(e) of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 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; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Forth Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-81 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *see* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). 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). Because third party interests can provide a compelling reason to withhold information, we will consider whether or not any of the submitted information is excepted under the Act.

Meditech raises section 552.110 of the Government Code for its submitted information. 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. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b).

Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 (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 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

---

<sup>1</sup>The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors 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).

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. *See* 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.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 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).

Meditech states some of its submitted information consists of trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, however, we determine Meditech has failed to demonstrate any portion of the information it seeks to withhold 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); *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982). Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Meditech also contends some of its submitted information is excepted under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Meditech argues release of this information could compromise its position in the market. However, Meditech has failed to demonstrate how release of this information would cause it substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b). Further, we note that Meditech was the winning bidder in this instance. This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest; thus, the pricing information of a winning bidder is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors); *see generally* Dep’t of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-345 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Further, the terms of a contract with a governmental body are generally not excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.022(a)(3) (contract involving receipt or expenditure of public funds expressly made public); Open Records Decision No. 541 at 8 (1990) (public has interest in knowing terms of contract with state agency). Accordingly, we conclude that the county may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. As no further arguments against disclosure have been made, the submitted information must be released.

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](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,



Andrea L. Caldwell  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ALC/eeg

Ref: ID# 413615

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Maryanne E. Giglia  
Assistant Corporate Counsel  
MEDITECH  
MEDITECH Circle  
Westwood, Massachusetts 02090  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Eric Gray  
Corporate Legal Counsel  
Cerner Corporations  
2800 Rockcreek Parkway  
North Kansas City, Missouri 64117  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kenny Barfield  
General Counsel  
Healthcare Management Systems, Inc.  
3102 West End Avenue, Suite 400  
Nashville, Tennessee 37203  
(w/o enclosures)