



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 22, 2008

Mr. Carey E. Smith
General Counsel
Health and Human Services
P.O. Box 13247
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2008-05275

Dear Mr. Smith:

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# 307878.

The Texas Health and Human Services Commission (the "commission") received a request for two specified applications from Caremark and ten specified applications from CVS/Pharmacy ("CVS").¹ You state that some of CVS's information has been provided to the requestor. You make no arguments and take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure. Instead, you state that the request may implicate the proprietary interest of CVS. Pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, you have notified CVS of the request and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released. *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 the Act in certain circumstances). We have received comments from the legal representative of CVS. We have reviewed the submitted information and considered the submitted arguments.

¹We note that the commission sought and received clarification of the information requested. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222 (if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request).

Initially, you state that the requestor excluded social security numbers, driver's license numbers, and driver's license expiration dates from his request for information. Thus, any of this information contained within the submitted documents is not responsive to the present request. Accordingly, we do not address this information and it need not be released.

Next, we note that the present request seeks two specified applications from Caremark and ten specified applications from CVS. You have only submitted nine applications from CVS for our review. Thus, to the extent any additional information existed on the date the commission received this request, we assume you have released it. If you have not released the two Caremark applications and the remaining CVS application, you must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301(a), .302; *see also* 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 now address the commission's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a), (b). Further, pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) general written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *Id.* § 552.301(e)(1)(A)-(D). You indicate that the commission received the request for information on January 10, 2008. You indicate that you requested a clarification regarding the request on January 16, 2008, and received a response to your request for clarification on January 22, 2008 and February 1, 2008. However, you did not request a ruling from this office or submit the documents at issue until February 15, 2007. Thus, the commission failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Normally, a compelling reason for non-disclosure exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records

Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Because third party interests can provide compelling reasons to withhold information, we will address whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under the Act.

CVS claims that some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects: (1) trade secrets, and (2) commercial or financial information the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *See* Gov't Code § 552.110(a), (b). Section 552.110(a) protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *See id.* § 552.110(a). A "trade secret"

may consist of any formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] 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, as for example the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees. . . . A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, 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); Open Records Decision Nos. 255 (1980), 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

There are six factors to be assessed in determining whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (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 to [its] competitors;

(5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing this information; and

(6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see also* ORD 232. This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. Open Records Decision No. 552 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable 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. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) protects “[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). This exception to disclosure 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. *Id.* § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

After reviewing the arguments and the requested information, we find that CVS has failed to demonstrate how any portion of the submitted information meets the definition of a trade secret. *See* ORD 552 at 5-6; *see also* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939) (information is generally not trade secret if it is “simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business” rather than “a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business”). We therefore determine that no portion of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a). We further note that CVS has not established by specific factual evidence that release of any of the requested information would cause it substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (1999) (for information to be withheld under section 552.110(b), business must show by specific factual evidence that substantial competitive injury would result from release of particular information at issue), 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 is too speculative), 319 at 3

(1982) (information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, qualifications, and pricing not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Accordingly, we determine that none of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). As no other arguments against disclosure have been raised, the submitted information 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,



Loan Hong-Turney
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LH/eeg

Ref: ID# 307878

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Casey Cabalquinto
Change to Win
1900 L Street NW, Suite 900
Washington, DC 20036
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Benno Weisburg
Foley & Lardner, LLP
321 North Clark Street, Suite 2800
Chicago, Illinois 60610
(w/o enclosures)