



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 28, 2014

Mr. Mike Williford
Walker County Purchasing
Walker County
1301 Sam Houston Avenue, Suite 235
Huntsville, Texas 77340

OR2014-05225

Dear Mr. Williford:

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# 518152.

Walker County (the "county") received a request for information pertaining to the Inmate Phone System Request for Proposals No. C2360-13-004. You indicate the county has released some of the requested information. 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 Crown Correctional Telephone ("Crown"); Infinity Networks, Inc. ("Infinity"); Inmate Communications, Inc. ("Inmate"); Lattice Incorporated ("Lattice"); Legacy Inmate Communications ("Legacy"); Securus Technologies, Inc. ("Securus"); and Synergy 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 Lattice and Securus. 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 not received comments from Crown, Infinity, Inmate, Legacy, or Synergy explaining why their information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude Crown, Infinity, Inmate, Legacy, or Synergy 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 county may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest of Crown, Infinity, Inmate, Legacy, or Synergy may have in it.

Next, Lattice and Securus each claim portions of their information are excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which 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* ORD 552. 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 (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 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* ORD 661 at 5-6.

Upon review, we find Lattice has established its customer information constitutes a trade secret. Accordingly, to the extent the customer information at issue is not publicly available on Lattice’s website, the county must withhold Lattice’s customer information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(a). However, we find Lattice and Securus have failed to demonstrate that any of the remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have Lattice or Securus demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (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). Thus, none of Lattice’s remaining information or Securus’s information may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review of Lattice’s and Securus’s arguments under section 552.110(b), we find Lattice has established its pricing information, which we have marked, constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive

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 (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

injury. Therefore, the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find Lattice and Securus have not demonstrated the release of any of the remaining information would result in substantial damage to either company's competitive position. Thus, Lattice and Securus have not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of their 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 Lattice's remaining information or Securus's information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

We note some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.² Section 552.136 states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential." Gov't Code § 552.136. This office has concluded insurance policy numbers constitute access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, we find the county must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the materials at issue 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, to the extent the customer information at issue is not publicly available on Lattice's website, the county must withhold Lattice's customer information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The county must also withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The county must release the remaining information, but any information protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

²The 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).

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,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/akg

Ref: ID# 518152

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Synergy
12126 El Sendero
San Antonio, Texas 78233
(w/o enclosures)

Infinity Networks
P.O. Box 30137
Austin, Texas 78755
(w/o enclosures)

Inmate Communications
1004 West Front Street
Midland, Texas 79701
(w/o enclosures)

Andrew Jones
Securus Technologies
14651 Dallas Parkway, 6th Floor
Dallas, Texas 75254-8815
(w/o enclosures)

Jim Gant
Lattice, Inc.
113 Daisy Path
Georgetown, Texas 78633
(w/o enclosures)

Legacy Inmate Communications
10833 Valley View Street, Suite 150
Cypress, California 90630
(w/o enclosures)

Crown Correctional Telephone
P.O. Box 5099
Granbury, Texas 76049
(w/o enclosures)