



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

January 13, 2010

Ms. Denika Caruthers  
Assistant District Attorney  
Dallas County District Attorney's Office  
411 Elm Street, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor, Suite 500  
Dallas, Texas 75202-3384

OR2010-00640

Dear Ms. Caruthers:

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# 367437.

Dallas County (the "county") received a request for all records pertaining to the requestor from January 2001 to the present and all records related to Access Language Center ("Access"). You state that you have no information responsive to the portion of the request seeking information involving the requestor.<sup>1</sup> You state you are releasing other responsive information to the requestor. You take no position on whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure, but you state that the release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of Access. Accordingly, you state you have notified Access of the county's receipt of the request for information and the company's to submit arguments to this office as to why the information should not be released to the requestor. 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

---

<sup>1</sup>The Act does not require a governmental body that receives a request for information to create information that did not exist when the request was received. See *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex. Civ. App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision Nos. 605 at 2 (1992), 563 at 8 (1990), 555 at 1-2 (1990).

received arguments from Access. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the county's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures that a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to section 552.301(b) of the Government Code, the governmental body must request a ruling from this office and state the exceptions to disclosure that apply within ten business days after receiving the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b). Pursuant to section 552.301(e) of the Government Code, the governmental body is required to submit to this office within fifteen business days of receiving the request (1) general written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *See id.* § 552.301(e). In this instance, you state the county received the request for information on October 9, 2009. Accordingly, the county's ten business-day deadline was October 23, 2009, and county's the fifteen business-day deadline was October 30, 2009. However, the county did not request a ruling from our office or submit the information at issue until November 3, 2009. *See id.* § 552.308 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Thus, we find the county failed to comply with the requirements mandated by section 552.301.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 279 S.W.3d 806, 811 (Tex. App.—Amarillo 2007, pet. granted); *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). A compelling reason exists when third-party interests are at stake or when information is confidential by law. Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). Because third party interests are at stake, we will address whether the submitted information must be withheld to protect the interests of Access.

Next, we note Access seeks to withhold information that was not submitted to this office by the county. Because much of the information that Access seeks to withhold was not submitted by the governmental body, this ruling does not address that information and is limited to the information submitted by the county. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested). Thus, we will only address Access' arguments against disclosure of the information that was actually submitted to this office for our review.

Access argues portions of the submitted information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. This section protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure two types of information: trade secrets and commercial or financial information the release of which would cause a third party substantial competitive harm. *See id.* § 552.110(a), (b). 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. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). Section 757 provides 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 . . . [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. 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];
- (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). 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. 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* 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).


Upon review of Access’ arguments, we find Access has failed to demonstrate how any portion of the information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has Access demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for the information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 402 (section 552.110(a) does not apply unless information meets definition of trade secret and necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish trade secret claim), 319 at 2 (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, experience, and pricing not excepted under section 552.110). Therefore, the county may not withhold any of the submitted information pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Upon review of the arguments and information at issue, we find Access has demonstrated that release of portions of the submitted information would cause the company substantial competitive harm, and thus, the information we have marked must be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, Access has made only conclusory allegations that release of the remaining information at issue would cause the company substantial competitive injury and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. *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), 319 at 3 (1982). Therefore, the county must withhold only the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. As no further arguments against disclosure are raised, the remaining information must be released to the requestor.

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,



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

ALS/rl

Ref: ID# 367437

Enc. Submitted documents

cc: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

c: Mr. Gerda Stendell  
President  
Access Language Center  
1221 West Campbell Road, Suite 261  
Richardson, Texas 75080-2968  
(w/o enclosures)