ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

October 2, 2012

Ms. Jena R. Abel
Assistant General Counsel
Texas Board of Nursing
333 Guadalupe Street, Suite 3-460
Austin, Texas 78701-3942

OR2012-15648

Dear Ms. Abel:

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# 466616.

The Texas Board of Nursing (the "board") received a request for the final version of the proposal submitted by Bell Tech Career Institute ("Bell Tech") to establish a new vocational nursing education program. Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Bell Tech. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Bell Tech of the request for information and of its 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 Bell Tech. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Bell Tech raises 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." Gov't Code § 552.101. However, Bell Tech has not directed our attention to any law, nor are we aware of any law, under which any of the submitted information is considered to be confidential for purposes of section 552.101 of the

Government Code. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy), 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality). Therefore, the board may not withhold any of Bell Tech's information under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

Bell Tech asserts that its proposal is excepted from disclosure 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. However, section 552.104 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 a governmental body in a competitive situation, and not interests of private parties submitting information to the government), 522 (1989) (discretionary exceptions in general). As the board does not seek to withhold any information pursuant to this exception, we find section 552.104 is not applicable to Bell Tech's proposal. *See* ORD 592 (governmental body may waive section 552.104).

Bell Tech argues 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. *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 a trade secret from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts, which holds a trade secret to be:

> 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 Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 776 (Tex. 1958). 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] 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* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 5 (1990). However, we cannot conclude that 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). We note pricing information pertaining to a particular proposal or 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." *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939); *Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776; Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 3, 306 at 3.

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. *See id.*; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5 (1999).

Bell Tech contends its proposal constitutes trade secrets under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. After reviewing the company's arguments and the information at issue, we conclude Bell Tech has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any of its information is a trade secret protected by section 552.110(a). *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 402 (1983) (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 (1982) (information relating to organization, personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications, and experience not excepted under section 552.110).

---

[1]The 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* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

Thus, the board may not withhold any portion of Bell Tech's information under section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

Bell Tech also contends its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code. Upon review, however, we find Bell Tech has not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) establishing that the release of any of its information would cause the company substantial competitive harm. *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). Accordingly, the board may not withhold any portion of Bell Tech's information under section 552.110(b). As you raise no exceptions to disclosure, the requested information must be released in it entirety.

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,

Jeffrey W. Giles
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JWG/tch

Ref: ID# 466616

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. L.A. Dunham
Counsel for Bell Tech Career Institute
Jim L. Culpepper & Associates, P.C.
9821 Katy Freeway, Suite 110
Houston, Texas 77024-1208
(w/o enclosures)