



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 3, 2012

Ms. L. Renee Lowe
Assistant County Attorney
Harris County
2525 Holly Hall, Suite 190
Houston, Texas 77054

OR2012-00057

Dear Ms. Lowe:

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# 440963 (CA File No. 11HSP1030).

The Harris County Hospital District (the "district") received a request for the contract and proposals pertaining to the bid for a palm vein scanning system. We understand you to claim some of the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.136 of the Government Code. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the remaining requested information, you state the proprietary interests of certain third parties might be implicated. Accordingly, you notified Ultra-Scan Corporation ("Ultra-Scan"); American Unit Inc. ("American Unit"); Dell Marketing L.P. ("Dell"); Kratos|HBE, formerly Henry Brothers Electronics, Inc. ("HBE"); Fujitsu Computer Products of America, Inc. ("Fujitsu"); and HT Systems ("HT") of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office explaining why their information should not be released. *See Gov't Code* § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in certain circumstances). We have received comments from Ultra-Scan, HBE, Fujitsu, and HT. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the district's obligations under the Act. Section 552.301 of the Government Code describes the procedural obligations placed on a governmental body that receives a written request for information it wishes to withhold. 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). In this instance, you state the district received the request for information on October 4, 2011. Accordingly, the district's ten-business-day deadline was October 18, 2011. The envelope in which the district submitted its request for a ruling request bears a postmark of October 24, 2011. *See id.* § 552.308 (providing ten-day requirement met if request bears post office cancellation mark indicating time within ten-day period). Thus, we find the district failed to comply with the requirements of 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 the requested information is public and must be released, unless a compelling reason exists to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *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, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). Generally, a compelling reason to withhold information exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Because third party interests can provide compelling reasons to withhold information, we will consider whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under the Act.

Next, 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 American Unit or Dell explaining why their submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude American Unit or Dell have protected proprietary interests in this 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. Consequently, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests American Unit or Dell may have in the information.

Ultra-Scan, HBE, Fujitsu, and HT each claim section 552.110 of the Government Code for portions of the submitted information. Section 552.110 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. Section 552.110(a) 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 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 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 that section 552.110(a) applies 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983). We 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 (1939); *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 255, 232 (1979), 217 (1978).

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(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).

After reviewing the submitted arguments and the information at issue, we conclude Ultra-Scan has demonstrated that a portion of its client information constitutes trade secrets for purposes of section 552.110(a). Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(a). However, we note Ultra-Scan has made some of its client information, and Fujitsu and HT have made all of their client information, publicly available on their websites. Because Ultra-Scan, Fujitsu, and HT have published this information, these companies have failed to demonstrate how this information constitutes trade secret information for purposes of section 552.110(a). In addition, we find Ultra-Scan, Fujitsu, and HT have failed to establish any of the remaining information at issue meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have these companies demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for the remaining information. Thus, the district may not withhold any portion of the remaining information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Ultra-Scan, HBE, Fujitsu, and HT assert portions of the remaining information are excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). In advancing its argument, HBE appears to rely, in part, 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 HBE’s interest in its information.

After reviewing the submitted arguments and the information at issue, we conclude Ultra-Scan and HBE have established that release of portions of the remaining information

would cause them substantial competitive harm. Accordingly, the district must withhold the information we have marked in the remaining information under section 552.110(b). However, we find Ultra-Scan, Fujitsu, and HT have failed to provide specific factual evidence demonstrating release of any of the remaining information would result in substantial competitive harm to the companies. *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, and qualifications are not ordinarily excepted from disclosure under statutory predecessor to section 552.110). Furthermore, we note the pricing information of a winning bidder, such as Fujitsu and HT, is generally not excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b). This office considers the prices charged in government contract awards to be a matter of strong public interest. *See* Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors). *See generally* Dep't of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-345 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is a cost of doing business with government). Accordingly, the district may not withhold any of the remaining information pursuant to section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

You state you have redacted insurance policy numbers pursuant to Open Records Decision No. 684 (2009). That decision is a previous determination to all governmental bodies authorizing them to withhold ten categories of information, including insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code, without the necessity of requesting an attorney general decision. However, as of September 1, 2011, the Texas legislature amended section 552.136 to allow a governmental body to redact the information described in section 552.136(b) without the necessity of seeking a decision from the attorney general. *See* Gov't Code § 552.136(c). If a governmental body redacts such information, it must notify the requestor in accordance with section 552.136(e). *See id.* § 552.136(d), (e). Thus, the statutory amendments to section 552.136 of the Government Code superceded Open Records Decision No. 684 on September 1, 2011. Therefore, a governmental body may only redact information subject to subsection 552.136(b) in accordance with section 552.136, not Open Records Decision No. 684. Section 552.136 of the Government Code states that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.” *Id.* § 552.136. This office has determined insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. Accordingly, we find the district must withhold the insurance policy numbers you have redacted, and the additional insurance policy numbers we have marked, under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note portions of the remaining information may be protected by copyright. A custodian of public records must comply with copyright law and is not required to furnish copies of

records that are copyrighted. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). However, 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 copyright law and the risk of a copyright infringement suit.

In summary, the district must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The district must also withhold the marked insurance policy numbers under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Sarah Casterline', with a large, stylized flourish at the end.

Sarah Casterline
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SEC/ag

Ref: ID# 440963

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Alan D. Jankowski
Ultra-Scan Corporation
4240 Ridge Lea Road
Anherst, New York 14226
(w/o enclosures)

Dell Marketing, L.P.
General Counsel's Office
One Dell Way
Round Rock, Texas 78652
(w/o enclosures)

American Unit, Inc.
2801 Network Boulevard, Suite 810
Frisco, Texas 75034
(w/o enclosures)

Kratos Defense
Formerly Henry Brothers Electronics, Inc.
4820 Eastgate Mall
San Diego, California 92121
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David Wiener
High Tech Systems
3640 Northwest 41st Street
Miami, Florida 33142
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Cynthia Hom
Fujitsu Computer Products of America
10211 Pacific Mesa Boulevard, Suite 409
San Diego, California 92121
(w/o enclosures)