



**KEN PAXTON**  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

January 12, 2016

Ms. Michele Freeland  
Legal Assistant  
Office of General Counsel  
Texas Department of Public Safety  
P.O. Box 4087  
Austin, Texas 78773-0001

OR2015-26206A

Dear Ms. Freeland:

This office issued Open Records Letter No. 2015-26206 (2015) on December 14, 2015. We have examined this ruling and determined we will correct the previously issued ruling. Consequently, this decision serves as the corrected ruling and is a substitute for the decision issued on December 14, 2015. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.011 (providing that Office of the Attorney General may issue a decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of the Public Information Act (the "Act")). This ruling was assigned ID# 599481 (DPS PIR # 15-4580 and 15-4742).

The Texas Department of Public Safety (the "department") received two requests from different requestors for the proposals submitted in response to solicitation number 405-15-R017548.<sup>1</sup> Although we understand you take no position with respect to

---

<sup>1</sup>We note the department failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting a decision from this office with respect to some of the submitted information responsive to the second request for information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e) (requiring governmental body to submit within fifteen business days of receiving request for information comments explaining applicability of raised exceptions, copy of request for information, signed statement of date governmental body received request or evidence sufficient to establish date, and copy of information governmental body seeks to withhold or representative samples). Nonetheless, third party interests can provide a compelling reason to overcome the presumption of openness caused by a failure to comply with section 552.301. *See id.* § 552.302; Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Because third party interests are at stake in this instance, we will address the public availability of the information at issue.

whether the requested information is excepted from disclosure, you state its release may implicate the interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation demonstrating, you notified Xerox Services d/b/a HELP, Inc. ("HELP"), Intelligent Imaging Systems ("Intelligent"), and L-3 Mobile Vision, Inc. ("L-3") of the requests for information and of their right to submit arguments stating why their information should not be released. *See id.* § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information and the arguments submitted by HELP and Intelligent.

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) of the Government Code 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, this office has not received comments from L-3 explaining why its information should not be released to the requestors. Thus, we have no basis to conclude the release of the submitted information would implicate the interests of L-3, and none of the submitted information may be withheld on that basis. *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.

Next, HELP and Intelligent seek to withhold information the department did not submit for our review. Because such information was not submitted by the governmental body, this ruling does not address that information and is limited to the information submitted as responsive by the department. *See Gov't Code* § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested).

Intelligent argues 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 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. *Id.* § 552.110. 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 763 (Tex.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (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 has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5-6 (1990). 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.*; ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

---

<sup>2</sup>The six factors that the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information constitutes a trade secret are:

(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).

Upon review, we find Intelligent has failed to demonstrate the submitted information for which it asserts section 552.110(a) meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Accordingly, we conclude the department may not withhold the information at issue on the basis of section 552.110(a). Furthermore, we find Intelligent has not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of the submitted information for which it asserts section 552.110(b) would cause the company substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (statutory predecessor to section 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing). We therefore conclude the department may not withhold the information at issue under section 552.110(b).

We note portions of the submitted information are subject to section 552.130 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> Section 552.130 provides information relating to a motor vehicle operator's or driver's license or permit, a motor vehicle title or registration, or a personal identification document issued by an agency of Texas or another state or country is excepted from public release. Gov't Code § 552.130(a). We conclude the department must withhold the images of license plates in the submitted information under section 552.130 of the Government Code.

We note some of the remaining information appears to be subject to copyright law. 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 department must withhold the images of license plates in the submitted information under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The department must release the remaining information; however, any information protected by 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.

---

<sup>3</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. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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,



Lindsay E. Hale  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LEH/bhf

Ref: ID# 599481

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mark Doughty  
Vice President & COO  
HELP, Inc.  
Suite 2275  
101 North First Avenue  
Phoenix, Arizona 85003  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Izzy Valdovino  
L-3 Mobile Vision, Inc.  
90 Fanny Road  
Boonton, New Jersey 07005  
(w/o enclosures)