



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

November 2, 2004

Ms. Ruth H. Soucy
Manager and Legal Counsel
Comptroller of Public Accounts
P.O. Box 13528
Austin, Texas 78711-3528

OR2004-9325

Dear Ms. Soucy:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 212130.

The Comptroller of Public Accounts (the "comptroller") received a request for copies of the bid proposals submitted in response to RFO 304-4-0491NK. You state that you will provide the requestor with a portion of the requested information. You take no position with respect to the remaining requested information, however, you claim that portions of it may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Public Information Act (the "Act"). Pursuant to section 552.305(d) of the Government Code, you have notified third parties NetManage, Inc. ("NetManage") and Seagull Software Systems, Inc. ("Seagull") of the request and of their opportunity to submit comments to this office. *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 section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

NetManage raises section 552.101 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." *Gov't Code § 552.101*. Section 552.101 encompasses information that other law makes confidential. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1 (1992)* (common-law privacy), *600 at 4 (1992)* (constitutional privacy), *478 at 2 (1987)* (statutory confidentiality). NetManage has not directed our attention to any law, nor are we aware of any law, under which any portion of its proposal is confidential for purposes of section 552.101. *See Open Records Decision No. 455 (1987)* (absent special circumstances, home

addresses and telephone numbers of private citizens generally not protected under Act's privacy exceptions). Thus, we find NetManage has not demonstrated that section 552.101 is applicable to any portion of its proposal.

NetManage also raises section 552.139 of the Government Code. Section 552.139 provides in pertinent part:

(a) Information is excepted from the requirements of Section 552.021 if it is information that relates to computer network security or to the design, operation, or defense of a computer network.

(b) The following information is confidential:

(1) a computer network vulnerability report; and

(2) any other assessment of the extent to which data processing operations, a computer, or a computer program, network, system, or software of a governmental body or of a contractor of a governmental body is vulnerable to unauthorized access or harm, including an assessment of the extent to which the governmental body's or contractor's electronically stored information is vulnerable to alteration, damage, or erasure.

Id. § 552.139. Although NetManage raises section 552.139(b)(2), it did not submit any arguments to this office explaining the applicability of that section to the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 542 (1990) (stating that governmental body has burden of establishing that exception applies to requested information), 532 (1989), 515 (1988), 252 (1980). Furthermore, NetManage's proposal is not a computer network vulnerability assessment or report. Consequently, none of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.139.

Both NetManage and Seagull raise section 552.110 of the Government Code for portions of their information. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) "[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision," 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." Gov't Code § 552.110(a)-(b). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a "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 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 also Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958). If a governmental body takes no position on the application of the "trade secrets" component of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a private party's claim for exception as valid under that component if that party establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception, and no one submits an argument that rebuts the claim as a matter of law.¹ *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). However, the private party must provide information that is sufficient to enable this office to conclude that the information at issue qualifies as a trade secret under section 552.110(a). *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 at 3 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) excepts from disclosure "[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). An entity will not meet its burden under section 552.110(b) by a mere conclusory assertion of a possibility of commercial harm. *Cf. National Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765, 770 (D.C. Cir. 1974). The governmental body or interested third party raising section 552.110(b) must provide a specific factual or evidentiary showing that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure

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).

of the requested information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 639 at 4 (1996) (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).

Based on the arguments presented by NetManage and Seagull, and our review of the information at issue, we find that both NetManage and Seagull have sufficiently demonstrated that portions of their proposals constitute trade secret information or commercial and financial information, the release of which would cause their companies substantial competitive harm. We have marked this information, which the comptroller must withhold. We conclude, however, that both NetManage and Seagull have failed to demonstrate that any other portion of their respective proposals constitute trade secret information or commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause their companies substantial competitive harm under section 552.110. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 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 was entirely too speculative), 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). Accordingly, pursuant to section 552.110, the comptroller must withhold only those portions of the requested proposals that we have marked.

We note, however, that some of the information contained in these proposals is 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. 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).

In summary, the comptroller must withhold the information we have marked in the submitted proposals pursuant to section 552.110 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released in accordance with applicable copyright laws.

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 Dep't of Pub. 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,



Lauren E. Kleine
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEK/jev

Ref: ID# 212130

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jim Tefft
Account Executive
Attachment Corporation
4265 San Felipe, Suite 1100
Houston, Texas 77027
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Kim B. Addington
Seagull Software Systems, Inc.
3340 Peachtree Road, Northeast
Atlanta, Georgia 30326
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Lino Mendiola III
Andrews & Kurth, LLP
111 Congress Avenue, Suite 1700
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)