



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 18, 2008

Ms. Donna L. Clarke
Office of the Criminal District Attorney
916 Main Street, Suite 1018
Lubbock, Texas 79401

OR2008-12864

Dear Ms. Clarke:

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# 322182.

Lubbock County (the "county") received four requests from different requestors for the responses provided to the county regarding the Request for Proposals for Inmate Telephone Services. You state you have released portions of the requested information. Although you take no position on the remaining requested information, you state it may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, the district notified Inmate Communications ("Inmate"); Global Tel Link ("Global"); Public Communications Services, Inc. ("PCS"); Teletrust, Inc. ("Teletrust"); Synergy Telecom Service Co., Inc. ("Synergy"); and Securus Technology ("Securus") of the request for information and of each company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why its requested information should not be released.¹ *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 comments from PCS and Synergy. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

¹We note each requestor has a right of access to its own proposal.

Initially, we note that 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 requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, Inmate, Global, Teletrust, and Securus have not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why their submitted information should not be released. Therefore, these companies have not provided us with any basis to conclude they have protected proprietary interests in any of the submitted information. *See* 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. Accordingly, we conclude the county may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Inmate, Global, Teletrust, or Securus may have in the information.

PCS claims portions of its submitted information are excepted from disclosure 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. 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). PCS, however, has not directed our attention to any law under which any of the submitted information is considered to be confidential for the purposes of section 552.101. We therefore conclude the county may not withhold any of the submitted information under PCS's claim of section 552.101 of the Government Code.

PCS and Synergy claim portions of their information are 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 (1939); *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. ORD 552. However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown 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 Nat'l Parks & Conservation Ass'n v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974); Open Records Decision No. 661 (1999).

Both PCS and Synergy claim section 552.110(a) for portions of their submitted information. Having considered PCS's and Synergy's arguments, we conclude each company has established a *prima facie* case that a portion of its submitted information, which we have marked, constitutes a trade secret. Therefore, the county must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. PCS and Synergy, however, have failed to demonstrate any portion of their remaining information at issue constitutes a trade secret. Thus, the remaining information at issue may not be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Synergy also argues section 552.110(b) for its remaining information. Upon review, we determine Synergy has established release of some of its remaining information would cause it substantial competitive injury. Therefore, the county must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. As to the remaining information at issue, we find Synergy has made only conclusory allegations that release of this information would result in substantial damage to its competitive position. Thus, Synergy has not demonstrated substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of the remaining information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661 (for information to be withheld under commercial or financial information prong of section 552.110, 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, professional references, market studies, qualifications, and pricing are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Accordingly, the county may not withhold the remaining information under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note portions of the remaining information are subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.² Section 552.136 of the Government Code states “[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. Upon review, we find the county must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

We also note portions of the submitted information are protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with the copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of records that are protected by copyright. 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 materials protected by copyright, 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 county must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 and the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136. The remaining information must be released, 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 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,



Melanie J. Villars
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MJV/jh

Ref: ID# 322182

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Rudy Pena
Securus
P.O. Box 542373
Dallas, Texas 75354
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Connie O'Neal
Inmate Communications
5025 Princeton, Suite 4
Midland, Texas 79706
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Rick Ferguson
Global Tel Link
3060 CR 1202
Maud, Texas 75567
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Joe Garbs
Public Communications Services, Inc
2620 River Oaks Drive
Arlington, Texas 76006
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Charles Flowers
Teletrust, Inc.
P.O. Box 2450
Lubbock, Texas 79408
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Lena Smith
Synergy Telecom Service Co., Inc.
12126 El Sendero
San Antonio, Texas 78233
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Charles Slarughter
Synergy Telecom Service Company, Inc.
12126 El Sendero
San Antonio, Texas 78233
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Janet Marshall
Global Tel Link
6612 East 75th Street
Fourth Floor
Indianapolis, Indiana 46250
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Kara Pfeiffer
Consolidated Communications Public Services
121 South 17th Street
Mattoon, Illinois 61938
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. James M. McCown
Nesbitt, Vassat, McCown & Roden, L.L.P.
15851 Dallas Parkway, suite 800
Addison, Texas 75001
(w/o enclosures)