



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 25, 2014

Mr. Damon C. Derrick
General Counsel
Stephen F. Austin State University
P.O. Box 13065
Nacogdoches, Texas 75962-3065

OR2014-04941

Dear Mr. Derrick:

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# 517704.

Stephen F. Austin State University (the "university") received a request for the proposals and tabulation sheets for a specified request for proposals. You indicate you have released some information to the requestor. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified M Group Agency; MSG PR Ltd. Co.; Point A Media, Inc.; and TWG Solutions, LLC ("TWG") 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 TWG. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note 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, we have only received comments from TWG explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the remaining third parties has 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 university may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest any of the remaining third parties may have in it.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code 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, which holds a trade secret to be:

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* *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 776 (Tex. 1958). 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 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

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

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).

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* ORD 661 at 5.

TWG asserts portions of its information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find TWG has established a *prima facie* case that the customer information it seeks to withhold constitutes trade secret information. However, any customer identities that have been published on TWG’s website do not constitute trade secret information. Accordingly, to the extent any of the customer information TWG seeks to withhold has been published on the company’s website, such information is not confidential under section 552.110(a). Therefore, the university must withhold TWG’s customer information under section 552.110(a), provided the customer information has not been published on the company’s website. We also conclude TWG has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any portion of its remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret. We further find TWG has not demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for its remaining information. *See* ORDs 402, 319 at 2 (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). Therefore, none of TWG’s remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(a).

TWG argues some of the remaining information consists of commercial or financial information the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. To the extent any of the customer identities TWG seeks to withhold have been published on its website, we find TWG has failed to establish release of such information would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Upon review, we find TWG has not established any of the remaining information constitutes commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, none of TWG’s remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note some of the submitted information may 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. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; *see* Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). 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.

In summary, the university must withhold TWG's customer information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code, provided the customer information has not been published on the company's website. The university must release the remaining information, but any information subject to copyright may only be released in accordance with 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Kristi L. Wilkins
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

KLW/tch

Ref: ID# 517704

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Kim Flasch
Vice President, Finance
TWG Solutions, LLC
4330 Gaines Ranch Loop, Suite 220
Austin, Texas 78735
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Angie Brewer
Point A Media
2908 Westward Drive
Nacogdoches, Texas 75964
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Lee Miller
MSG PR Ltd. Co.
1511 South Chestnut
Lufkin, Texas 75901
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Janet Mitchell
M Group Agency
3445 Executive Center Drive
Austin, Texas 78731
(w/o enclosures)