ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 21, 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

OR2007-02074

Dear Ms. Villarreal-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# 272389.

The Texas Department of Insurance (the "department") received a request for "filing #2677646," which pertains to United HealthCare of Texas, Inc. ("United"). You do not take a position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act; however, United, in correspondence with this office, asserts that the requested information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code.[1] *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances). We have considered the submitted arguments and examined the submitted information.

United asserts that the submitted information was designated as confidential when it was submitted to the department. We note that information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot, through a contract, overrule or repeal provisions of the Act. Attorney General Opinioin JM-672 (1987). Consequently, unless the submitted information falls within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any agreement between United and the department specifying otherwise.

[1]Although United also raises section 552.101 of the Government Code for its proprietary information, section 552.110 is the proper exception to claim for this type of information. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b). Therefore, we will address United's arguments under section 552.110.

United asserts that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. This section 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.

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), *cert. denied*, 358 U.S. 898 (1958). If the 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.[2] *See* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). 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) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations,

---

[2]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).

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).

After reviewing United's arguments and the information at issue, we conclude that United has demonstrated that some of the information at issue, which we have marked, constitutes trade secret information and must be withheld pursuant to section 552.110 of the Government Code. Moreover, we have received no arguments that would rebut this claim as a matter of law. However, we conclude United has failed to make a *prima facie* case that the remaining submitted information constitutes a trade secret. *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939) (information is generally not trade secret unless it constitutes "a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business"). Furthermore, we find United has not established by specific factual evidence that the remaining information it seeks to withhold is excepted from disclosure as commercial or financial information the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive harm under section 552.110(b). *See* Open Records Decision No. 661 (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue). Therefore, the remaining information at issue must be released.

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,

James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/jww

Ref: ID# 272389

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. David T. Weber
Gardere Wynne Sewell LLP
600 Congress Avenue, 30th Floor
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John K. Edwards
Jackson Walker, L.L.P.
1401 McKinney Street, Suite 1900
Houston, Texas 77010
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Lori Cottingham
Compliance Analyst, Regulatory Affairs
PacifiCare, A UnitedHealthcare Company
12401 Research Boulevard, Building 1
Suite 220
Austin, Texas 78759-2316
(w/o enclosures)