



OFFICE *of the* ATTORNEY GENERAL  
GREG ABBOTT

January 2, 2003

Ms. Sheila Bailey Taylor  
Chief Administrative Law Judge  
State Office of Administrative Hearings  
P.O. Box 13025  
Austin, Texas 78711-3025

OR2003-0041

Dear Ms. Taylor:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 174448.

The State Office of Administrative Hearings ("SOAH") received a request for the file for SOAH Docket Number 454-03-0075.B. You claim that the requested information appears to be excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.110 of the Government Code. You indicate, and provide documentation showing, that SOAH has notified Universal Insurance Exchange ("Universal") and the Texas Department of Insurance ("TDI") of the request for information in order to afford each entity an opportunity to supply objections to release of the submitted information. *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 Public Information Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the arguments submitted by Universal and reviewed the submitted information.

Universal argues that the requested information is confidential under section 3A of article 21.28-A of the Insurance Code. Section 3A provides in part that:

- (a) All hearings, orders, notices, correspondence, reports, records, and other information in the possession of [TDI] relating to the supervision or conservatorship of any insurance company are confidential during the period of supervision and conservatorship. On termination of the supervision and conservatorship, the information in the custody of the department that relates to the supervision and conservatorship becomes public information.

Universal, however, does not state that it is currently under supervision or conservatorship. In fact, a review of the submitted information reveals that Universal and TDI have come to an agreement and entered into an Article 1.32 Order. Thus, it appears that Universal is not currently under supervision or conservatorship. Therefore, Universal has failed to demonstrate the applicability of section 3A of article 21.28-A of the Insurance Code to the submitted information. Consequently, the submitted information may not be withheld under section 552.101.

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. Section 552.110(a) protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a). A "trade secret"

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] 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, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees.... A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, 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, 776 (Tex. 1958); Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (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 to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and
- (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 No. 232 (1979). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 (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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Universal argues that paragraph 13 of the notice of hearing filed with SOAH consists of trade secret information. We find, however, that Universal has failed to establish that such information meets the definition of a trade secret. Thus, paragraph 13 of the notice of hearing filed with SOAH is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a). Accordingly, the submitted information must be released to the requestor in its entirety.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public

records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.--Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at 512/475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Karen A. Eckerle  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

- KAE/sdk

Ref: ID# 174448

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Kristina K. Bastian  
Skelton, Woody & Arnold  
P.O. Box 1609  
Austin, Texas 78767-1609  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Douglas P. Roberts  
Staff Attorney  
Texas Department of Insurance  
333 Guadalupe  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jay A. Thompson  
Thompson, Coe, Cousins & Irons  
701 Brazos, Suite 1500  
Austin, Texas 78701  
(w/o enclosures)