



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 2, 2010

Ms. Candice M. De La Garza
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 368
Houston, Texas 77001-0368

OR2010-07963

Dear Ms. De La Garza:

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# 381430.

The City of Houston (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to Invitation to Bid No. S33-T23263. You state the city has released some of the requested information. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state that release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified A&F Elevator Company, Inc., Kone, Inc., Mid-American Elevator Co. Inc/Elevator Repair Service, Inc. Joint Venture (Mid-American/ERS), and ThyssenKrupp Elevator of the 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 comments from Mid-American/ERS. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note, and you acknowledge, that the city has not complied with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Governmental Code in requesting this ruling. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b), (e). Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a

governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption that the information is public and must be released, unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information to overcome this presumption. *See id.* § 552.301; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). This office has held that a compelling reason exists to withhold information when the information is confidential by law or affects third party interests. *See* Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). Because third party interests can provide a compelling reason to withhold information, we will address the submitted arguments.

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, this office has not received comments from A&F Elevator Company, Inc., Kone, Inc., or ThyssenKrupp Elevator explaining why each third party's submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that these third parties have a protected proprietary interest 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. Accordingly, the district may not withhold any portion of the submitted information based upon the proprietary interests of A&F Elevator Company, Inc., Kone, Inc., or ThyssenKrupp Elevator.

Next, we consider Mid-American/ERS's arguments against disclosure of its information 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. *Id.* § 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 the 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); ORD 661.

Having considered Mid-American/ERS's arguments under section 552.110(a), we determine that Mid-American/ERS has made a *prima facie* case that some of its client information is protected as trade secret information. We note, however, Mid-American/ERS publishes the identities of some of its clients on its website. In light of Mid-American/ERS's own publication of such information, we cannot conclude the identities of these published clients qualify as trade secrets. Furthermore, Mid-American/ERS has failed to demonstrate that any portion of its remaining information constitutes a trade secret. Accordingly, the city must withhold only the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. We determine that no portion of Mid-American/ERS's remaining information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(a).

Upon review of Mid-American/ERS's arguments under section 552.110(b), we find that Mid-American/ERS has established that its balance sheets, profit and loss statements, and inventory list, which we have marked, constitute commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause the company substantial competitive injury. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find that Mid-American/ERS has made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of its remaining information would result in substantial damage to the company's competitive position. Thus, Mid-American/ERS has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of its remaining information at issue. *See* Open Records Decision No. 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). Accordingly, none of Mid-American/ERS's remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

We note that some of the remaining information is subject to section 552.101 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision."¹ Gov't Code § 552.101. This section encompasses the doctrine of common-law privacy. Common-law privacy protects information that (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. *Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 685 (Tex. 1976). The type of information considered intimate or embarrassing by the Texas Supreme Court in *Industrial Foundation* included information relating to sexual assault, pregnancy, mental or physical abuse in the workplace, illegitimate children, psychiatric

¹The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. This office has found that some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses are excepted from required public disclosure under common-law privacy. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps). Upon review, we find that the information we have marked is highly intimate or embarrassing and not of legitimate public concern. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under sections 552.0110(a) and 552.110(b) of the Government Code. The city must also withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy. The remaining information must be released.

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, 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# 381430

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kenneth R. Jones
Offices of Kenneth R. Jones, L.L.P.
For Mid American/E.R.S. Joint Venture
202 Travis, Suite 306
Houston, Texas 77002
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John L. Muncie
Branch Manager
Kone, Inc.
4607 World Houston Parkway, Suite 150
Houston, Texas 77032
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Essie Mianabi
Vice President
A&F Elevator Company
10110 Apple Ridge Drive
Houston, Texas 77040
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Clayton Rhodes
Sales Manager
ThyssenKrupp Elevator
148 Tomball Parkway, Suite 190
Houston, Texas 77086
(w/o enclosures)