



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 24, 2007

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

CORRECTED COPY

OR2007-00097A

Dear Ms. Villarreal-Reyna:

This office issued Open Records Letter No. 2007-00097 (2007) on January 4, 2007. We have examined this ruling and determined that we made an error. Where this office determines that an error was made in the decision process under sections 552.301 and 552.306, and that error resulted in an incorrect decision, we will correct the previously issued ruling. Consequently, this decision serves as the correct ruling and is a substitute for the decision issued on January 4, 2006. *See generally* Gov't Code 552.011 (providing that Office of Attorney General may issue decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of Public Information Act (the "Act"))).

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Act, chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 268481.

The Texas Department of Insurance (the "department") received a request for a specified rate filing. You state that you have released some information to the requestor. Although you raise no exceptions to disclosure, you state that release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Progressive County Mutual Insurance Company ("Progressive"). Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, that you notified Progressive of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *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 in

certain circumstances). Progressive responded to the notice. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Progressive claims that its rate filing is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code, which protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: trade secrets and commercial or financial information the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. Gov't Code § 552.110. Progressive claims its information is a trade secret. Section 552.110(a) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision.” *See id.* § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). Section 757 provides that a trade secret is

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 Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776. 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.¹ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office has held that if a governmental body takes no position with regard to the application of the trade secret

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).

branch of section 552.110 to requested information, we must 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 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) applies 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). After reviewing Progressive's arguments and the submitted information, we agree that the information Progressive seeks to withhold is trade secret information. Progressive has established a *prima facie* case for the exemption of this information, and this office received no arguments that rebut Progressive's claim as a matter of law. Thus, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

We note that an e-mail address contained in the submitted information is excepted under section 552.137 of the Government Code. This section excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body" unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c). See Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail address you have marked does not appear to be of a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). In addition, you do not inform us that the department has received consent for the release of the e-mail address at issue. Therefore, the department must withhold the e-mail address we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code.

Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code and the marked e-mail address under section 552.137 of the Government Code. The remaining submitted information must be released to the requestor.

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, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, 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 Office of the Attorney General 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. 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/eb

Ref: ID# 268481

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Eric Quesnel
Infinity Insurance Co.
11700 Great Oaks Way
Alpharetta, Georgia 30022
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jonathan Klein
Progressive County Mutual Insurance Company
6300 Wilson Mills Road
Mayfield Village, Ohio 44143-2182
(w/o enclosures)

CT Corporation System
For Progressive County Mutual Insurance Company
350 North St. Paul Street
Dallas, Texas 75201
(w/o enclosures)

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