



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

August 8, 2007

Ms. Marie A. Taylor  
Assistant City Attorney  
City of El Paso  
2 Civic Center Plaza, 9<sup>th</sup> Floor  
El Paso, Texas 79901

OR2007-10153

Dear Ms. Taylor:

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# 286049.

The City of El Paso (the "city") received a request for proposals submitted in response to the city's solicitation for an Automated Fingerprint Identification System, the final evaluation scoring, testing data, and pricing tables. While you raise section 552.101 of the Government Code as a possible exception to disclosure, you do not take a position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act. However, you note that release of the submitted information may implicate the protected proprietary interests of Cogent Systems ("Cogent") and Sagem Morpho, Inc. ("Sagem Morpho"). You state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified Cogent and Sagem Morpho of the city's receipt of the request for information and of the right of each to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestor. *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 reviewed the submitted information.<sup>1</sup>

Initially, we note that Sagem Morpho has informed this office that it does not object to the release of its proposal. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the proposal at issue based on the proprietary interests of Sagem Morpho. *See Gov't Code* §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also*

---

<sup>1</sup>We note that the department has redacted some of the submitted information. As we are able in this instance to discern the nature of the redacted information, we will determine whether it is excepted from public disclosure. In the future, the city should refrain from redacting any information that it submits to this office in seeking an open records ruling. *See Gov't Code* §§ 552.301(e)(1)(D), .302.

Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

We next address the arguments raised by Cogent. Cogent asserts that some of the information at issue is excepted under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. 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.” Gov’t Code § 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.<sup>2</sup> 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 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

---

<sup>2</sup>The following are the six factors that the Restatement gives 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 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 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).

claim. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). Cogent claims that the information it seeks to withhold is “unique to the design proposed by Cogent in response to the [c]ity’s Request for Proposals.” We conclude that Cogent has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any of the submitted information is a trade secret. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). Thus, the city may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110.

We note that submitted information contains insurance policy numbers. Section 552.136 of the Government Code states that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” Gov’t Code § 552.136.<sup>3</sup> The city must, therefore, withhold the insurance policy numbers that we have marked under section 552.136. The remaining 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).

---

<sup>3</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception like section 552.136 on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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,



L. Joseph James  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

LJJ/eeg

Ref: ID# 286049

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Raffie Beroukhim  
MSSI Vice President  
Worldwide Biometric Sales  
1250 North Tustin Avenue  
Anaheim, California 92807  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. James Xie  
Vice President  
Cogent, Inc.  
209 Fair Oaks Avenue  
South Pasadena, California 91030  
(w/o enclosure)

Mr. Gary Penley  
Senior Vice President  
Sagem Morpho, Inc.  
1145 Broadway Plaza, Suite 200  
Tacoma, Washington 98402  
(w/o enclosures)