



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 16, 2009

Mr. Brett Norbraten  
Open Records Attorney  
Texas Department of Aging and Disability Services  
P.O. Box 149030  
Austin, Texas 78714-9030

OR2009-14650

Dear Mr. Norbraten:

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# 358565 (DADS #2009SOLEG0148).

The Texas Department of Aging and Disability Services (the "department") received a request for all current contracts and proposals pertaining to LexisNexis. You state that the department will release portions of the requested information. Although you take no position as to the disclosure of the submitted information, you state that it may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified LexisNexis of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why its 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 comments from LexisNexis. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

LexisNexis claims that some of its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. 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 Gov't Code § 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. Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). 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* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

LexisNexis claims that, with the exception of the “total price for the option selected,” its pricing information and business strategy information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a). Upon review, we find LexisNexis has not shown that the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret or demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim. We note that pricing information pertaining to a particular contract is generally not a trade secret because it is “simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of business,” rather than “a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business.” *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3 (1982), 306 at 3 (1982). We therefore conclude that the department may not withhold any of LexisNexis’s information as a trade secret under section 552.110(a).

We understand LexisNexis to assert the information at issue is excepted under section 552.110(b). We find, however, that LexisNexis has failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating release of any of the information at issue would result in substantial competitive harm to the company. *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 (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). Additionally, we note that the pricing information of a winning bidder, such as LexisNexis in this instance, is generally not excepted under section 552.110. *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors); *see generally* Freedom of Information Act Guide & Privacy Act Overview at 219 (2000) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act exemption reason that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). We therefore conclude that the department may not withhold any of LexisNexis’s information under section 552.110(b).


We note that a portion of the submitted information is protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with federal 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). As no further exceptions to disclosure have been raised, the submitted information must be released, but any information subject to copyright may only be released in accordance with federal copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information 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 information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php), or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Jennifer Luttrall  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JL/dls

Ref: ID# 358565

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David E. Ciolli  
Director and Senior Corporate Counsel  
LexisNexis  
9443 Springboro Pike  
Miamisburg, Ohio 45342  
(w/o enclosures)