ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 20, 2005

Ms. Cynthia Villareal-Reyna
Section Chief, Agency Counsel
Legal and Compliance Division, MC 110-1A
Texas Department of Insurance
P. O. Box 149104
Austin, Texas 78714-9104

OR2005-00603

Dear Ms. Villareal-Reyna:

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# 217397.

The Texas Department of Insurance (the "department") received a request for "personal auto rate filings" pertaining to five specified insurance companies. Although the department takes no position with regard to the release of the requested information, you state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified an interested third party, Home State County Mutual Insurance Company ("Home State"), of the department's receipt of the request and of Home State's right to submit arguments to us as to why any portion of the requested information pertaining to Home State should not be released to the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* 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 under Act in certain circumstances). We have considered arguments submitted to us by Home State and have reviewed the submitted information.

We note at the outset that the department only submitted to us responsive information pertaining to Home State. We, therefore, presume that the department has already provided the requestor with the remaining requested information to the extent that it existed on the date of the department's receipt of the request for information. If not, then the department must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .301, .302; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (noting that if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible under circumstances).

Next, we address arguments submitted to us by Home State. Home State argues that portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.110 of the Government Code. 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." *See* 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).

---

[1]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 (1939); *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

Section 552.110(b) 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

Home State argues that its underwriting guidelines and rules and any "updates" pertaining to those guidelines and rules that have been submitted to us for review by the department constitute trade secrets that are excepted from disclosure pursuant to section 552.110(a). Home State also argues that this information constitutes commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm to Home State under section 552.110(b). Based on Home State's arguments and our review of the submitted information, we find that Home State has demonstrated that its underwriting guidelines and rules and any "updates" pertaining to those guidelines and rules constitute trade secrets for purposes of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. We have received no arguments that rebut Home State's claims as a matter of law. Accordingly, we conclude that the department must withhold the portions of Home State's submission to the department pertaining to Home State's underwriting guidelines and rules and any "updates" pertaining to those guidelines and rules pursuant to section 552.110 of the Government Code. However, because we also find that Home State has not demonstrated that any other portion of the submitted information qualifies as a trade secret under section 552.110(a) or information, the release of which would cause Home State substantial competitive harm, under section 552.110(b), we also conclude that the department may not withhold any other portion of the submitted information under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Consequently, the department must release the remaining submitted information to the requestor.

Home State requests that this office issue a "previous determination" that would permit the department in the future to withhold from disclosure the company's underwriting guidelines without the need of requesting a ruling from us about whether such information can be withheld from disclosure. We decline to issue such a previous determination at this time.

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,

Cindy Nettles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

CN/krl

Ref: ID# 217397

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jeff Reynolds
205 East 10th Street
Amarillo, Texas 79101
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Johnny Michael Davis, President
Home State County Mutual
4315 Lake Shore Drive, Suite J
Waco, Texas 76714
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bruce McCandless III
Long, Burner, Park, and DeLargy
P. O. Box 2212
Austin, Texas 78768-2212
(w/o enclosures)