



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

December 16, 2011

Mr. Ronald J. Bounds
Assistant City Attorney
City of Corpus Christi
P.O. Box 9277
Corpus Christi, Texas 78469

OR2011-18545

Dear Mr. Bounds:

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# 439205.

The City of Corpus Christi (the "city") received a request for all proposals submitted in response to request for proposals number BI-0050-11. Although you take no position on whether the requested information is excepted from disclosure, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of LabLynx, Inc. ("LabLynx"), PerkinElmer Health Sciences, Inc. ("PerkinElmer"), Promium, LLC ("Promium"), and Starlims Corporation ("Starlims"). Accordingly, you have notified these third parties 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 received comments from LabLynx and Starlims. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

We note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B)*. As of the date of this decision, we have not received correspondence from PerkinElmer or Promium.

Thus, PerkinElmer and Promium have not demonstrated that they have a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); 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 city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests PerkinElmer or Promium may have in the information.

We understand LabLynx and Starlims to assert some of their submitted information is protected under 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. Section 552.101 encompasses the common-law right of privacy, which protects information that is (1) highly intimate or embarrassing, such that its release would be highly objectionable to a reasonable person, and (2) not of legitimate concern to the public. *See Indus. Found. v. Tex. Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976). To demonstrate the applicability of common-law privacy, both prongs of this test must be established. *Id.* at 681-82. The types 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 treatment of mental disorders, attempted suicide, and injuries to sexual organs. *Id.* at 683. Prior decisions of this office have determined personal financial information not related to a transaction between an individual and a governmental body generally meets the first prong of the common-law privacy test. *See generally* Open Records Decision No. 600 (1992). However, whether financial information is subject to a legitimate public interest and not protected by common-law privacy must be determined on a case-by-case basis. *See* Open Records Decision No. 373 (1983). We further note common-law privacy protects the interests of individuals, not those of corporate and other business entities. *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 United States v. Morton Salt Co.*, 338 U.S. 632, 652 (1950) (cited in *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). Upon review, we find no portion of LabLynx’s or Starlims’s information constitutes highly intimate or embarrassing information about an individual. Accordingly, no portion of this information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with common-law privacy.

Starlims raises section 552.102(a) of the Government Code as an exception to disclosure of a portion of its proposal. Section 552.102(a) excepts from disclosure “information in a personnel file, the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of

personal privacy[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.102(a). Section 552.102(a) protects information relating to public officials and employees. *See* Open Records Decision No. 345 (1982). In this instance, the information at issue is related to a private entity, Starlims. Therefore, the city may not withhold any portion of Starlims’s proposal under section 552.102(a) of the Government Code.

Starlims seeks to withhold a portion of the submitted information pursuant to section 552.104 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure “information that, if released, would give advantage to a competitor or bidder.” Gov’t Code § 552.104. Section 552.104, however, is a discretionary exception that protects only the interests of a governmental body, as distinguished from exceptions that are intended to protect the interests of third parties. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 592 (1991) (statutory predecessor to section 552.104 designed to protect interests of governmental body in competitive situation, and not interests of private parties submitting information to government), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). As the city does not seek to withhold any information pursuant to this exception, we find section 552.104 is not applicable to the submitted information. *See* ORD 592 (governmental body may waive section 552.104).

Starlims raises, and we understand LabLynx to raise, section 552.110 of the Government Code for portions of its information. 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.” Gov’t Code § 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. 1958); *see also* ORD 552 at 2. 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 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 private person's claim for exception as valid under section 552.110 if that person establishes a *prima facie* case for exception and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. ORD 552 at 5-6. However, we cannot conclude section 552.110(a) applies 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) excepts from disclosure "[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). Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the requested information. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

LabyLynx and Starlims contend portions of their information constitute trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Upon review, we find LabLynx and Starlims have established their customer information constitutes a trade secret; therefore, the city must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(a). Additionally, we find that Starlims has established a *prima facie* case that some of its remaining information, including its technical processes, constitutes a trade secret. Accordingly, the city must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, we find LabLynx and Starlims have failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any of the remaining information at issue is a trade secret protected by section 552.110(a). *See* ORDs 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

¹The following are the six factors the Restatement gives 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 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).

section 552.110). We further note 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 the business,” rather than “a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business.” RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; ORDs 319 at 3, 306 at 3. Therefore, the city may not withhold any of the submitted pricing information under section 552.110(a).

Starlims also argues that release of its submitted information would cause substantial harm to its competitive position. In advancing its argument, Starlims relies on the test pertaining to the applicability of the section 552(b)(4) exemption under the federal Freedom of Information Act to third-party information held by a federal agency, as announced in *National Parks & Conservation Association v. Morton*, 498 F.2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974). The *National Parks* test provides that commercial or financial information is confidential if disclosure of information is likely to impair a governmental body’s ability to obtain necessary information in future. *National Parks*, 498 F.2d 765. Although this office once applied the *National Parks* test under the statutory predecessor to section 552.110, that standard was overturned by the Third Court of Appeals when it held *National Parks* was not a judicial decision within the meaning of former section 552.110. *See Birnbaum v. Alliance of Am. Insurers*, 994 S.W.2d 766 (Tex. App.—Austin 1999, pet. denied). Section 552.110(b) now expressly states the standard to be applied and requires a specific factual demonstration that the release of the information in question would cause the business enterprise that submitted the information substantial competitive harm. *See* ORD 661 at 5-6 (discussing enactment of section 552.110(b) by Seventy-sixth Legislature). The ability of a governmental body to continue to obtain information from private parties is not a relevant consideration under section 552.110(b). *Id.* Therefore, we will consider only Starlims’s interest in its information.

Starlims and LabLynx claim portions of the remaining information at issue, including pricing information, constitute commercial or financial information that, if released, would cause these companies substantial competitive harm. After reviewing the submitted arguments and the information at issue, we find LabLynx and Starlims have established release of their pricing information would cause the companies substantial competitive harm. Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked, under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. However, we find LabLynx and Starlims have not demonstrated how release of the remaining information at issue would cause the companies substantial competitive harm, and have provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such assertions. *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 (statutory predecessor to section 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to

organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, and qualifications and experience), 175 at 4 (1977) (resumes cannot be said to fall within any exception to the Act). Consequently, the city may not withhold any of the remaining information at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note portions of the submitted information may 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. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; see Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). 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.

In summary, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released; however; any information that is protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with 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, 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,



Vanessa Burgess
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

VB/dls

Ref: ID# 439205

Enc. Submitted documents

Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Alan Vaughan
LabLynx, Inc.
2400 Lake Park Drive, Suite 435
Smyrna, Georgia 30080
(Third party w/o enclosures)

Mr. Craig Babinec
Mr. Kevin A. Tucker
Ms. Gwen George-Bruno
PerkinElmer Health Sciences, Inc.
Labworks waterLIMS
710 Bridgeport Avenue
Shelton, Connecticut 06484
(Third party w/o enclosures)

Mr. Scot Cocanour
Chief Executive Officer
Promium, L.L.C.
3350 Monte Villa Parkway, Suite 220
Bothell, Washington 98021
(Third party w/o enclosures)

STARLIMS Corporation
c/o Ms. Joanne L. Zimolzak
McKenna, Long & Aldridge, L.L.P.
1900 K Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20006
(Third party w/o enclosures)