



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 30, 2008

Mr. Carey E. Smith
General Counsel
Texas Health and Human Services Commission
P.O. Box 1347
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2008-07371

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# 311294.

The Texas Health and Human Services Commission (the "commission") received two requests from different requestors for the information submitted in response to RFI 529-07-0178. You state that the commission has released some of the requested information. Although you take no position regarding the public availability of the submitted information, pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code you have notified Nutur Health, Inc. ("Nudur"); McKesson Health Solutions, LLC ("McKesson"); PharmMD Solutions, LLC ("PharmMD"); and SHPS, Inc. ("SHPS") of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested 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 Act in certain circumstances). McKesson has responded to the notice and argues that portions of the submitted information are excepted under sections 552.104 and 552.110 of the Government Code. Nutur and PharmMD have also responded to the notice and argue that portions of the submitted information are excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that McKesson has submitted, and Pharm MD references, information each company seeks to withhold from disclosure; however, the commission did not submit this information. This ruling does not address information that was not submitted by the commission and is limited to the information submitted as responsive by the commission. See Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested).

An interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305(d) to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. See *id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from SHPS explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that SHPS has protected proprietary interests in the submitted information. See *id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990). Accordingly, the commission may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of SHPS's proprietary interests.

Next, Nurtur asserts that some of its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. This exception encompasses information that is considered to be confidential under other constitutional, statutory, or decisional law. See Open Records Decision Nos. 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality), 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy). Nurtur has not directed our attention to any law under which any of its submitted information is considered to be confidential for purposes of section 552.101. Therefore, the commission may not withhold any of the submitted information pertaining to Nurtur under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

McKesson raises section 552.104 of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure. Section 552.104 excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." *Id.* § 552.104. Section 552.104 is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions which are intended to protect the interests of third parties. See Open Records Decision Nos. 592 (1991) (statutory predecessor to section 552.104 designed to protect interests of a governmental body in a competitive situation, and not interests of private parties submitting information to the government), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). As the commission did not submit any arguments in support of withholding any information pursuant to section 552.104, the commission may not withhold any of McKesson's

information pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code. See ORD 592 (governmental body may waive section 552.104).

Section 552.110 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. 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.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 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. ORD 552

¹The 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).

at 5-6. 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).

Section 552.110(b) excepts from disclosure “[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). 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 requested information. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

After reviewing the arguments presented by Nutur, McKesson, and Pharm MD as well as the information at issue, we determine that each company has failed to demonstrate that any portion of this information meets the definition of a trade secret. Further, we conclude that Nutur, McKesson, and Pharm MD have made only conclusory allegations and have provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support their allegations that release of the submitted information would cause their companies substantial competitive injury. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110; *see also, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 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, and qualifications not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Thus, no portion of the submitted information pertaining to these companies may be withheld under section 552.110(b). As neither the commission, Nutur, McKesson, nor Pharm MD raise any further exceptions to disclosure, the 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 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,



Jennifer Luttrall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JL/eeg

Ref: ID#311294

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jason Cooke
Principal
Health Management Associates
515 Congress Avenue, Suite 1760
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Keven Ryan
VP Corporate Development
McKesson Health Solutions
335 Interlocken Parkway
Broomfield, Colorado 80021
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Israel Rollins
PharmMD Solutions
216 Centerview Drive, Suite 390
Brentwood, Tennessee 37027
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Geanene Aube
VP Government Solutions
SHPS, Inc.
3300 Millwater Crossing
Dacula, Georgia 30019
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dan Cave
President and Chief Executive Officer
Nutur Health
20 Batterson Park Road
Farmington, Connecticut 06032
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jerry M. Keyes
Matheson/Keys, PLLC
7004 Bee Cave Road, Building 1, Suite 110
Austin, Texas 78746
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Janet W. Farrer
Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld, LLP
200 West 6th Street, Suite 2100
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jason S. Gordon
Government Business Development Consultant
BlueCross BlueShield of Tennessee
801 Pine Street
Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402
(w/o enclosures)