



Office of the Attorney General  
State of Texas

DAN MORALES  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

May 13, 1997

The Honorable Mike Driscoll  
County Attorney  
1001 Preston, Suite 634  
Houston, Texas 77002-1891

OR97-0841

Dear Mr. Driscoll:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 34143.

Harris County (the "county") received a request for three of the bid proposals regarding job number 95-0117. You explain that you do not object to releasing the requested information. You raise a concern, however, that the requested information may be proprietary or subject to a copyright, and therefore, excepted from required public disclosure. You have submitted for our review the proposals at issue from the three responding companies, Nursefinders, Inc., Hospital Homecare Corp., and Home Health Consulting.

Since the property and privacy rights of third parties may be implicated by the release of the requested information here, this office notified the three entities whose company information was requested. *See* Gov't Code § 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 that statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Open Records Act in certain circumstances).

Neither Nursefinders, Inc., nor Home Health Consulting responded to our notice; therefore, we have no basis to conclude that these companies' information is excepted from disclosure. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 639 (1996) at 4 (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure), 552 (1990) at 5 (party must establish prima facie case that information is trade secret), 542 (1990) at 3. The

proposals of these two companies that did not respond, must, therefore, be released to the requestor.

Hospital Homecare Corporation responded to our notification and raises section 552.110 as an exception to disclosure of exhibits 1, 3, and 4 of its information. Section 552.110 protects the property interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision.

The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of "trade secret" from the Restatement of Torts, section 757, 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 a single or ephemeral event 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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex.), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958). If a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the "trade secrets" branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we accept a private person's claim for exception as valid under that branch if that person establishes a prima facie case for exception and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990) at 5.<sup>1</sup> After reviewing the arguments presented by Hospital Homecare Corp., we find that it has established that exhibits 1, 3, 4 of its proposal are protected as trade secrets. The county must therefore withhold this information.

---

<sup>1</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 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 (1982) at 2, 306 (1982) at 2, 255 (1980) at 2.

Hospital Homecare Corporation additionally argues that portions of its proposal, including exhibit 2, are subject to copyright protection and should not be reproduced. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* 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. See Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

We are resolving this matter with an informal letter ruling rather than with a published open records decision. This ruling is limited to the particular records at issue under the facts presented to us in this request and should not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records. If you have questions about this ruling, please contact our office.

Yours very truly,



Don Ballard  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JDB/ch

Ref: ID# 34143

Enclosures: Submitted documents

cc: Mr. William H. Kittles  
First American Mgt. Services  
#8 St. Andrews Court  
Brunswick, Georgia 31520  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Darlene Gaskill  
Nursefinders, Inc.  
4100 Westheimer, Suite 113  
Houston, Texas 77027  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Arthur L. Rice  
Hospital Homecare Corporation  
1140 Empire Central, Suite 500  
Dallas, Texas 75247  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert C. Rains, II  
Home Health Consulting  
4145 Byron Street  
Houston, Texas 77005-3515  
(w/o enclosures)