



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 17, 2008

Mr. Richard L. Bilbie
Assistant City Attorney
City of Harlingen
P.O. Box 2207
Harlingen, Texas 78551

OR2008-17143

Dear Mr. Bilbie:

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# 330481.

The City of Harlingen (the "city") received a request for "all bids and any evaluation documents used by Harlingen [in] evaluating personnel for RFP No. 2008-23 (Live Scan Fingerprint System for HPD)" and the resulting contract. The requestor specifically excludes from his request the documents of Mentalix, Inc. You state that the city will release 22 pages of information responsive to the request for evaluation documents. You claim that the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.110 of the Government Code. You also state that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Cogent Systems, Inc. ("Cogent") and L-1 Identity Solutions ("L-1"). You notified Cogent and L-1 of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under certain circumstances). We have considered the exceptions you claim and have reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, the city informs us that some of the submitted information is marked as confidential and proprietary. 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 by 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 did not satisfy requirements

of statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.110). Consequently, the submitted information must be released unless it falls within an exception to disclosure, notwithstanding any expectation or agreement to the contrary.

Next, we address the city's argument that disclosure of the submitted information "would amount to invasion of privacy through the disclosure of private facts." Based on this statement, we understand the city to contend that the submitted information is protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy. Section 552.101 of the Government Code 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 common-law privacy and excepts from disclosure private facts about an individual. *See Indus. Found.*, 540 S.W.2d 668. Information is excepted from required public disclosure by a common-law right of privacy if the information (1) contains highly intimate or embarrassing facts, the publication of which would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) is not of legitimate concern to the public. *Id.* at 685. We note, that common-law privacy protects the privacy interests of individuals, but not of corporations or other types of business organizations. *See Open Records Decision Nos. 620 (1993) (corporation has no right to privacy), 192 (1978) (right to privacy is designed primarily to protect human feelings and sensibilities, rather than property, business, or other pecuniary interests); see also U. S. v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950); *Rosen v. Matthews Constr. Co.*, 777 S.W.2d 434 (Tex. App.—Houston [14th Dist.] 1989), *rev'd on other grounds*, 796 S.W.2d 692 (Tex. 1990) (corporation has no right to privacy). In this instance, the information at issue pertains to businesses and not to an individual. Accordingly, we find that the submitted information is not protected under the doctrine of common-law privacy. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information under section 552.101 in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Next, 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 information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B)*. As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from either Cogent or L-1 explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, Cogent and L-1 have not provided us with any basis to conclude that they have any 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*. Thus, we address the city's argument under section 552.110 of the Government Code.

The city contends that 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 trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 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. 1957); *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 (1939). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case

¹The 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).

for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *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. 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* ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

In this instance, we find that the city has failed to establish that the submitted information constitutes protected trade secrets of either Cogent or L-1 under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. We further find that the city has failed to provide a specific factual or evidentiary showing that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure of the submitted information for purposes of section 552.110(b). Thus, we conclude that the city has not adequately demonstrated that the submitted information either consists of trade secrets or would harm the third parties’ competitive interests if released. Consequently, the submitted information is not excepted from disclosure under section 552.110.

Next, we note that the submitted information contains fingerprints and hand prints. Section 552.101 of the Government Code also encompasses chapter 560 of the Government Code, which provides that a governmental body may not release biometric identifier information except in certain limited circumstances. *See* Gov’t Code §§ 560.001 (defining “biometric identifier” to include fingerprints and records of hand geometry), .002 (prescribing manner in which biometric identifiers must be maintained and circumstances in which they can be released), .003 (providing that biometric identifiers in possession of governmental body are exempt from disclosure under the Act). You do not inform us, and the submitted information does not indicate, that section 560.002 permits the disclosure of the submitted fingerprint and hand print information. Therefore, the city must withhold the fingerprints and hand prints we have marked under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code.

We note that some of the submitted information appears to be 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 copyrighted. Attorney General Opinion JM-672. 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 city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 560.003 of the Government Code. The remaining information at issue must be released, but only 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,



Laura E. Ream
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LER/jb

Ref: ID# 330481

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jeff Carroll
Director of Business Development
L1 Biometrics Division
5705 West Old Shakopee Road, Suite 100
Bloomington, Minnesota 55437
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. James Xie
Vice President, Integration
Cogent Systems, Inc.
639 North Rosemead Boulevard
Pasadena, California 91107
(w/o enclosures)