



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

November 10, 2015

Ms. Rebecca Lundberg  
Assistant Criminal District Attorney  
County of Kaufman  
100 West Mulberry Street  
Kaufman, Texas 75142

OR2015-23673

Dear Ms. Lundberg:

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# 586592.

The Kaufman County Purchasing Department (the "county") received a request for three categories of information pertaining to a specified request for proposals. You claim the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Further, the county states release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of E.F. Johnson Company ("EFJ"), Harris Corporation, and Motorola Solutions, Inc. Accordingly, the county states, and provides documentation showing, it notified these third parties of the request for information and of their rights 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 EFJ. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.<sup>1</sup>

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 received comments from only EFJ explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude the remaining third parties have protected proprietary interests 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, release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the county may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests the remaining third parties may have in the information.

The county asserts the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. However, section 552.110 protects only the interests of the third parties that have provided information to a governmental body, not those of the governmental body itself. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110 (excepts from disclosure trade secret or commercial or financial information obtained from third party). Therefore, we do not address the county's argument under section 552.110.

EJF states some of its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. 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 id.* § 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

---

<sup>1</sup>We note the county did not comply with section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Nonetheless, because sections 552.110 and 552.136 of the Government Code can provide compelling reasons to overcome the presumption of openness, we will consider their applicability to the submitted information. *See id.* §§ 552.007, .302, .352. We also note the Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body. *See* Open Records Decision No. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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.<sup>2</sup> RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office must accept a claim 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 section 552.110(a) is applicable 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. 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 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, substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5.

---

<sup>2</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 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 also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

EFJ argues some of the information at issue constitutes commercial or financial information, the disclosure of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm. Upon review, we find EFJ has demonstrated portions of the information at issue constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause EFJ substantial competitive injury. Thus, the county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> However, we find EFJ has not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any portion of the remaining information at issue would cause EFJ substantial competitive harm. *See* ORD 661, 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), 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), 175 at 4 (1977) (résumés cannot be said to fall within any exception to the Act). Thus, the county may not withhold any portion of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. We also find EFJ has failed to establish a *prima facie* case any of the remaining information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has EFJ demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for the remaining information. *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; ORDs 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim), 319 at 2. Accordingly, the county may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136 of the Government Code provides, “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], 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(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Upon review, 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 remaining 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

---

<sup>3</sup>As our ruling is dispositive, we need not address the remaining argument against disclosure of this information.

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 county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The county must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The county must release the remaining information; however, the county may release information subject to copyright only 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](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,



Lee Seidlits  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CLS/som

Ref: ID# 586592

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Rob Bondurant  
Motorola Solutions, Inc.  
1507 LBJ Freeway, Suite 700  
Farmers Branch, Texas 75234  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Tom Clair  
Harris Corporation  
221 Jefferson Ridge Parkway  
Lynchburg, Virginia 24501  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Cindy York  
EF Johnson Technologies, Inc.  
1440 Corporative Drive  
Irving, Texas 75038-2401  
(w/o enclosures)