



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

September 3, 2008

Mr. David M. Swope  
Assistant County Attorney  
Harris County  
1019 Congress, 15<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Houston, Texas 77002

OR2008-10719A

Dear Mr. Swope:

This office issued Open Records Letter No. 2008-10719 (2008) on August 6, 2008. We have examined this ruling and determined that an error was made in its issuance. Where this office determines that an error was made in the decision process under sections 552.301 and 552.306 of the Government Code, and that error resulted in an incorrect decision, we will correct the previously issued ruling. Consequently, this decision serves as the corrected ruling and is a substitute for the decision issued on August 6, 2008. *See generally* Gov't Code § 552.011 (providing that Office of Attorney General may issue decision to maintain uniformity in application, operation, and interpretation of Public Information Act ("Act")). Your request was assigned ID# 320258.

Harris County (the "county") received a request for information regarding a specified request for proposals.<sup>1</sup> You claim that the requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.110 of the Government Code. You also believe that this request for information implicates the proprietary interests of Stancil Solutions ("Stancil") and EXACOM, Inc. ("EXACOM"). Accordingly, you notified these companies of this request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted 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 in the Act in certain circumstances). We have received correspondence from Stancil and EXACOM. We have considered the submitted arguments and have reviewed the submitted information.

EXACOM argues that some of its information is excepted from disclosure because it is marked as "Commercial in Confidence." We note that information is not confidential under the Act simply because the party submitting the information anticipates or requests that it be

---

<sup>1</sup>We note that the county also received an additional request for this information from another requestor. However, in a letter to our office, the second requestor withdrew his request for information.

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. See Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987); Open Records Decision Nos. 541 at 3 (1990) (“[T]he obligations of a governmental body under [the predecessor to 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 EXACOM’s information comes within an exception to disclosure, it must be released, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary. We also note that we have received correspondence from Stancil stating that it does not object to release of its information.

Next, we consider the county’s claims. Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects the proprietary interests of private parties with respect to 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.” Gov’t Code § 552.110(a)-(b).

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). If a governmental body takes no position on the application of the “trade secrets” aspect of section 552.110 to the information at issue, this office will accept a private person’s claim for exception as valid under section 552.110(a) if the person establishes a *prima facie* case for the exception, and no one submits an argument that rebuts

the claim as a matter of law.<sup>2</sup> See ORD 552 at 5. 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. See Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

~~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 information at issue. See ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).~~

Although the county raises section 552.110, it has not demonstrated that either section 552.110(a) or section 552.110(b) is applicable to any of the submitted information. Therefore, the county may not withhold any of the submitted information under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

Next, we address the county's arguments under section 552.101 of the Government Code. Section 552.101 excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. The county contends that some of the submitted information may be trademark-protected and thus excepted from disclosure under section 552.101. Section 1127 of title 15 of the United States Code provides that a trademark consists of

any word, name, symbol, or device, or any combination thereof . . . used by a person, or . . . which a person has a bona fide intention to use in commerce . . . to identify and distinguish his or her goods, including a unique product, from those manufactured or sold by others and to indicate the source of the goods, even if that source is unknown.

15 U.S.C. § 1127. Thus, a trademark pertains to the public use of information by a business enterprise to distinguish its goods or services from those of its competitors. The mere fact that information contains a trademark does not make the information confidential.

---

<sup>2</sup>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).

Furthermore, the county does not specify any particular provision of law, nor are we aware of any law, that makes any of the submitted information confidential. Accordingly, even if any of the submitted information is trademarked, it may not be withheld from disclosure under section 552.101. *See generally* Open Records Decision Nos. 478 (1987), 465 (1987) (statute must explicitly require confidentiality; confidentiality will not be inferred).

The county also asserts that some of the submitted information may be excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code on the basis of federal copyright law. However, copyright law does not make information confidential for purposes of section 552.101. *See* Open Records Decision No. 660 at 5 (1999). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted information unless an exception to disclosure applies to the information. *See* Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). An officer for public information must comply with copyright law, however, and is not required to furnish copies of copyrighted information. *Id.* A member of the public who wishes to make copies of copyrighted information 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 at 8-9 (1990). Thus, the county may not withhold the submitted information under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with copyright law, but any information that is protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

Lastly, we note that the submitted information contains insurance policy numbers that are excepted from disclosure under section 552.136 of the Government Code.<sup>3</sup> Section 552.136 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. The county must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In summary, the county must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code. The county must release the remaining information, but any copyrighted information may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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

---

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

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,



Amy L.S. Shipp  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

ALS/jb

Ref: ID# 320258

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jim Cessnun  
ATO Solutions Corporation  
310 Pinewood Drive  
Conroe, Texas 77385  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jerry Blanchard  
EXACOM, Inc.  
99 Airport Road  
Concord, New Hampshire 03301  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mike Hanner  
Stancil Solutions  
1335 Gateway Drive, Suite 2008  
Melbourne, Florida 32901  
(w/o enclosures)