



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 7, 2008

Mr. W. Montgomery Meitler
Assistant Counsel
Office of Legal Services
Texas Education Agency
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-1494

OR2008-09110

Dear Mr. Meitler:

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# 315743.

The Texas Education Agency (the "agency") received a request for the "TEA-Approved Driver Education Teacher Preparation Courses" for three named schools. You claim that a portion of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Although you take no position as to the disclosure of the remaining requested information, you state that it may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act. Accordingly, you state that the agency notified Colony Driving School, Inc. ("Colony"), Driver Education Services ("DES"), and Driving School of North Texas ("North Texas") of the request for information and 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) (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). We have received comments from Colony, DES, and North Texas. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information. We have also considered comments submitted by the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released).

Initially, we address North Texas's assertion that its information is marked as "Proprietary and the Intellectual Property of [North Texas]." We note that information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party that submits the information anticipates or requests that it be kept confidential. See *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 677 (Tex. 1976). In other words, a governmental body cannot overrule or repeal provisions of the Act through an agreement or contract. See Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) ("[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the Act] cannot be compromised simply by its decision to enter into a contract."), 203 at 1 (1978) (mere expectation of confidentiality by person supplying information does not satisfy requirements of statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110). Consequently, unless North Texas's information comes within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Colony raises section 552.104 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure "information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder." Gov't Code § 552.104. Although Colony raises section 552.104 for its preparation course materials, this section protects the interests of governmental bodies, not third parties. See Open Records Decision No. 592 (1991). As the agency does not raise section 552.104, this section is not applicable to the requested information. *Id.* (Gov't Code § 552.104 may be waived by governmental body). Therefore, the agency may not withhold Colony's preparation course materials under section 552.104.

Colony, North Texas, and DES each assert that their information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: (1) trade secrets and (2) commercial or financial information the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. See Gov't Code § 552.110. 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." The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. See *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1958); see also ORD 552 at 2. 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. 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 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. *Id.* § 552.110(b); *see also National Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); ORD 661.

DES asserts that its preparation course materials are a trade secret subject to exception under section 552.110(a). Having considered DES's arguments, we conclude that DES has established a *prima facie* case that its information constitutes a trade secret. Therefore, the agency must withhold DES's preparation course materials pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.²

Colony and North Texas assert that their preparation courses contain information subject to section 552.110(b). We find that Colony and North Texas have made only conclusory allegations that release of their information would cause substantive competitive injury, and have provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. We

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).

²As our ruling for this information is dispositive, we need not address DES's remaining arguments.

conclude that the agency may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110.

You claim that some of the remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.130 of the Government Code. Section 552.130 provides that information relating to a motor vehicle operator's license, driver's license, motor vehicle title, or registration issued by an agency of this state is excepted from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.130(a)(1)-(2). We agree that the agency must withhold the Texas driver's license information you have marked in the remaining submitted information.

Finally, we note that some of the remaining submitted materials are copyrighted. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* If a member of the public wishes to make copies of copyrighted materials, the person must do so unassisted by the governmental body. In making copies, the member of the public assumes the duty of compliance with the copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990).

In summary, the agency must withhold DES's teacher preparation course materials under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The agency must withhold the information you have marked under section 552.130 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released. Information that is subject to copyright must be released in accordance with that law.

You also ask this office to issue a previous determination permitting the agency to withhold Texas motor vehicle information under section 552.130 of the Government Code without the necessity of requesting a decision from this office. We decline to issue such a previous determination at this time. Accordingly, 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). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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,



Jonathan Miles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JM/jh

Ref: ID# 315743

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Samuel E. Shotts
Vista Ridge Driving School
2221 Cross Timbers Road, Suite 117
Flower Mound, Texas 75028
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Daniel Heredia
Colony Driving School, Inc.
3352 Highway 6 South
Sugarland, Texas 77478
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Robert E. Young
Driver Education Services
P.O. Box 1163
Arlington, Texas 76004-1163
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Tammy Hilz
Driving School of North Texas
1434 North Central Expressway, Suite 101
McKinney, Texas 75069
(w/o enclosures)