



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 5, 2012

Ms. Allyson Collins
General Counsel
Eanes Independent School District
601 Camp Craft Road
Austin, Texas 78746

OR2012-15974

Dear Ms. Collins:

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# 468210 (Eanes ISD Request Nos. 3291, 3293).

The Eanes Independent School District (the "district") received two requests for proposals submitted in response to a specified RFP for iPad insurance. You inform us ProtectMe and Safeware do not object to the release of their information and that the district will release some of the requested information. You do not take a position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under the Act. However, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified iCellutions and Worth Avenue Group ("Worth") of the district's receipt of the request for information and of the right of each to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 at 3 (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 correspondence from Worth objecting to the release of some of its information under the Act. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

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 requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code

§ 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have only received correspondence from Worth explaining why the requested information should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding any portion of the submitted information constitutes proprietary information of iCellutions, and the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on that basis. *See* 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, 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.

Worth argues some of the information at issue is excepted from disclosure 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.” Gov’t Code § 552.101. Worth has not directed our attention to any law under which any of the requested information is deemed confidential for purposes of section 552.101, nor are we aware of any. We therefore conclude no portion of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Worth claims some of its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.102 of the Government Code. Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy[.]” *Id.* § 552.102(a). Section 552.102 only applies to information in a personnel file of an employee of a governmental body. The information Worth seeks to withhold is not contained in the personnel file of a governmental employee. Thus, we determine section 552.102 does not apply to any of Worth’s information, and the district may not withhold it from release on that basis.

Worth also argues some of its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.104 of the Government Code. However, 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). The district did not assert section 552.104. Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the information at issue pursuant to that section. *See* ORD 592 (governmental body may waive section 552.104).

Worth asserts some of the information at issue is excepted from disclosure 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* ORD 552 at 2. 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.¹ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office 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. ORD 552 at 5-6. However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) applies unless it has been shown 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, substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the

¹The 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; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

requested information. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

We find Worth has established the release of some of the information at issue would cause substantial competitive injury. Therefore, the district must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b). However, we conclude Worth has not shown any of the remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret or demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a). We also find Worth has made only conclusory allegations that release of the information at issue would cause substantial competitive injury and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. *See id.* § 552.110(b). Therefore, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information pursuant to section 552.110. Accordingly, the district must release the remaining information to the requestor.

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,



James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/tch

Ref: ID# 468210

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Two Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Quang X. Ha
Director - Sales
Worth Ave. Group
1401 South Western
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Lance Carter
iCellutions
7329 East 6th Avenue
Scottsdale, Arizona 85251
(w/o enclosures)