



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

April 3, 2013

Mr. Daniel Plake  
Assistant Montgomery County Attorney  
207 West Phillips, Suite 100  
Conroe, Texas 77301

OR2013-05314

Dear Mr. Plake:

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# 483388.

The Montgomery County Attorney's Office (the "county attorney's office") received a request for specified agreements with Westlaw.<sup>1</sup> Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you inform us the release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Westlaw. Accordingly, you notified Westlaw of the request for information and of the company's 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 Act in certain circumstances).* You have submitted comments from Westlaw. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Westlaw claims some of the submitted information is protected by section 552(b)(6) of title 5 of the United States Code, the Freedom of Information Act ("FOIA"). We note FOIA is applicable to information held by an agency of the federal government. In this instance, the information at issue is held by an agency of Montgomery County, which is subject to the

---

<sup>1</sup>You inform us the county attorney's office sought and received clarification of the request. *See Gov't Code § 552.222(b)* (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); *see also City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of unclear or overbroad request for public information, ten-day period to request attorney general ruling is measured from date request is clarified or narrowed).

laws of the State of Texas. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-95 (1979) (FOIA exceptions apply to federal agencies, not to state agencies); Open Records Decision Nos. 496 (1988), 124 (1976); *see also Davidson v. Georgia*, 622 F.2d 895, 897 (5th Cir. 1980) (state governments are not subject to FOIA); Open Records Decision No. 561 at 7 n.3 (1990) (noting federal authorities may apply confidentiality principles found in FOIA differently from way in which such principles are applied under Texas open records law). This office has stated in numerous opinions that information in the possession of a governmental body of the State of Texas is not confidential or excepted from disclosure merely because the same information is or would be confidential in the hands of a federal agency. *See, e.g.*, Attorney General Opinion MW-95 (neither FOIA nor federal Privacy Act of 1974 applies to records held by state or local governmental bodies in Texas); ORD 124 (fact that information held by federal agency is excepted by FOIA does not necessarily mean that same information is excepted under Act when held by Texas governmental body). Thus, the county attorney's office may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of FOIA.

Westlaw generally raises section 552.101 of the Government Code for portions of the submitted information. This section excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. However, Westlaw has not pointed to any law, nor are we aware of any, that would make any of the submitted information confidential for purposes of section 552.101. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy), 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality). Therefore, the county attorney's office may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Westlaw also raises section 552.110 of the Government Code for some of the submitted information. This section 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." *See* 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. 1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). Section 757 provides 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>2</sup> RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office must accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under section 552.110 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." Gov't Code § 552.110(b). This section 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).

Westlaw raises section 552.110(a) for the information at issue. Upon review, we find Westlaw has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any of this information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has Westlaw demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. *See RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b, ORDs 402* (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and

---

<sup>2</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)*.

necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim), 319 at 3 (information relating to organization and personnel, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). We note pricing information pertaining to a particular proposal or 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.” See RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Thus, the county attorney’s office may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Westlaw also raises section 552.110(b) for the information at issue.<sup>3</sup> Upon review, we find Westlaw has made only conclusory allegations that the release this information would result in substantial harm to its competitive position. See Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 509 at 5 (1988) (because 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). Further, we note the pricing information of a winning bidder, such as Westlaw, is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). This office considers prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest. 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 cost of doing business with government). Consequently, the county attorney’s office may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note portions of the submitted information are subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code, which provides in part that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected,

---

<sup>3</sup>We note Westlaw cites, among other authorities, the federal court’s decision in *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). See also *Critical Mass Energy Project v. Nuclear Regulatory Comm’n*, 975 F.2d 871 (D.C. Cir. 1992) (commercial information exempt from disclosure if it is voluntarily submitted to government and is of kind that provider would not customarily make available to public). Although this office once applied the *National Parks* test under the statutory predecessor to section 552.110 of the Government Code, the Third Court of Appeals overturned that standard in holding *National Parks* was not a judicial decision within the meaning of former section 552.110. See *Birnbaum v. Alliance of Am. Insurers*, 994 S.W.2d 766 (Tex. App.—Austin 1999, pet. denied). Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard to be applied and requires a specific factual demonstration that release of the information in question would cause the business enterprise that submitted the information substantial competitive harm. See ORD 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of section 552.110(b) by Seventy-sixth Legislature). The ability of a governmental body to continue to obtain information from private parties is not a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *Id.* Therefore, we consider only Westlaw’s interests in withholding the information at issue.

assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.”<sup>4</sup> Gov’t Code § 552.136(b); *see also id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Accordingly, the county attorney’s office must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. As no further exceptions to disclosure are raised for the remaining information, the county attorney’s office must release it.

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,



Kenneth Leland Conyer  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

KLC/bhf

Ref: ID# 483388

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Westlaw  
C/O Ms. Barbara A. Lee  
FOIA Specialist, Government Segment  
Thomson Reuters  
610 Opperman Drive, Office D5-S507  
Eagan, Minnesota 55123  
(w/o enclosures)

---

<sup>4</sup>The 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).