



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 30, 2012

Mr. Brad Bowman
General Counsel
General Counsel's Office
Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation
P.O. Box 12157
Austin, Texas 78711

OR2012-11876

Dear Mr. Bowman:

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# 460353 (TDLR ID #8069).

The Texas Department of Licensing and Regulation (the "department") received a request for information pertaining to elevator-related accidents or injuries in Bexar County and the number of elevator-related accident or injury investigations statewide during a specified time period.¹ You state the department has released some of the requested information. You claim some of the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.107 of the Government Code.² You also state release of some of the remaining requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly,

¹We note the department asked for and received clarification regarding this request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222(b) (governmental body may communicate with requestor for purpose of clarifying or narrowing request for information); *see City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

²You also claim this information is protected under the attorney-client privilege based on Texas Rule of Evidence 503. In this instance, however, the information is properly addressed here under section 552.107, rather than rule 503. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 3 (2002).

you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Emerson Power Transmission Corporation (“Emerson”); the Hillard Corporation (“Hillard”); Leroy-Somer Power and Drives and Leroy-Somer North America (collectively “Leroy-Somer”); Ogura Industrial Corporation (“Ogura”); and Otis Elevator Company (“Otis”) 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 Otis, Hillard, and a representative for Emerson and Leroy-Somer.³ We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information, a portion of which is a representative sample.⁴

The department claims Exhibit 3 may be withheld under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. Gov’t Code § 552.107(1). When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made “for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services” to the client governmental body. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Tex. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding) (attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies to only communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. TEX. R. EVID. 503(b)(1). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies to only a confidential communication, *id.*, meaning it was “not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the

³In correspondence to our office, the representative for Leroy-Somer and Emerson state they do not object to release of the submitted information.

⁴We assume the “representative sample” of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

communication.” *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, orig. proceeding). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996) (privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You state Exhibit 3 consists of communications between department attorneys and department employees made for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services to the department. You have identified all parties to these communications. You also state the communications were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Based on your representations and our review, we find the department may withhold Exhibit 3 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code.

We note 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 Ogura explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude Ogura has 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 department may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of any proprietary interest Ogura may have in it.

Otis claims some of its information constitutes a trade secret under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code, while Hillard generally asserts its information is excepted under section 552.110 of the Government Code. Section 552.110 of the Government Code 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. *See Gov’t Code* § 552.110(a), (b). Section 552.110(a) protects trade secrets obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *See Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763 (Tex. 1957); *see also* ORD 552. 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.⁵ RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939). This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for the exception is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. *See* ORD 552 at 5. 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. *See* 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.*; *see also* ORD 661 at 5-6 (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual

⁵The Restatement of Torts lists the following six factors 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 other 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).

evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm).

Otis contends some of its submitted information constitutes a trade secret under section 552.110(a). Hillard asserts its information "is of a proprietary nature." Upon review, we find Otis has established the submitted Otis Maintenance Management System documents, which we have marked, constitute a trade secret. Accordingly, the department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. However, Otis and Hillard have failed to demonstrate any of the companies' remaining information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have the companies demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for their respective information. *See* Open Records Decision No. 319 at 3 (1982) (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). Thus, none of Otis's or Hillard's remaining information at issue may be withheld under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. In addition, we find Hillard has made only conclusory allegations the release of its remaining information would result in substantial damage to its competitive position. Thus, Hillard has not demonstrated substantial competitive injury would result from the release of any of its remaining information. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 661, 509 at 5 (1988) (because 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). Accordingly, none of Hillard's remaining information may be withheld under section 552.110(b).

We note portions of the remaining information are subject to section 552.137 of the Government Code, which excepts from disclosure "an e-mail address of a member of the public that is provided for the purpose of communicating electronically with a governmental body," unless the member of the public consents to its release or the e-mail address is of a type specifically excluded by subsection (c).⁶ Gov't Code § 552.137(a)-(c). The e-mail addresses we have marked are not a type specifically excluded by section 552.137(c). Accordingly, the department must withhold these e-mail addresses under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release under section 552.137(b).

We also note some of the materials at issue 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

⁶The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

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 department may withhold Exhibit 3 under section 552.107(1) of the Government Code. The department must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. The department must withhold the e-mail addresses we have marked under section 552.137 of the Government Code, unless the owners of the e-mail addresses affirmatively consent to their release under section 552.137(b). The remaining information must be released, but any information subject to 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,



Jennifer Burnett
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JB/tch

Ref: ID# 460353

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Juan G. Parra
Vice President
The Hilliard Corporation
100 West Fourth Street
Elmira, New York 14902-1504
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Justin Eberlein
Staff Attorney
Dispute Resolution
Emerson Electric Company
P.O. Box 4100
St. Louis, Missouri 63136-8506
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bradley M. Bingham
Counsel for Otis Elevator Company
Bingham, Mann & House
600 Jefferson, Suite 1040
Houston, Texas 77002
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Frank Flemming
President
Ogura Industrial Corporation
100 Randolph Road
Somerset, New Jersey 08873
(w/o enclosures)