



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

June 26, 2013

Ms. Jessica Holoubek
Allen Boone Humphries Robinson, L.L.P.
3200 Southwest Freeway, Suite 2600
Houston, Texas 77027

OR2013-10832

Dear Ms. Holoubek:

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# 491621.

The Fort Bend Grand Parkway Toll Road Authority (the "authority"), which you represent, received a request for the responses by Cofiroute USA, LLC ("Cofiroute"), Municipal Service Bureau ("MSB"), and Xerox State & Local Solutions, Inc. ("Xerox") for the Violation Processing System RFP. The authority does not take a position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under the Act. However, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified Cofiroute, MSB, and Xerox of the authority's receipt of the request for information and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 at 3 (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 correspondence from MSB objecting to the release of some of its information under section 552.110 of the Government Code. We have reviewed the submitted arguments and information.

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 requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, neither Cofiroute nor Xerox has submitted to this office any reasons explaining why the requested information should not be released. Thus, we have no basis for concluding any portion of the submitted information constitutes proprietary information of these third parties, and the authority may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on that basis. *See* 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, 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.

MSB asserts some of its information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110 of the Government Code. 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) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure “[a] trade secret obtained from a person and privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision.” 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* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). 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. This office must accept a private person’s claim for exception as valid under that branch 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).

¹The following are the six factors that 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; *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.” Section 552.110(b) requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, 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 release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

We find MSB has established the release of some of the information at issue would cause it substantial competitive injury. Therefore, the authority must withhold this information, which we have marked, under section 552.110(b). However, we note some of the information MSB seeks to withhold pertains to a customer who appears in a testimonial within the submitted documents. Thus, we find MSB has not established the information pertaining to this customer is excepted from disclosure under section 552.110. *See* ORD 319 at 3 (statutory predecessor to section 552.110 generally not applicable to professional references). We also find MSB has made only conclusory allegations that release of the remaining information at issue would cause these companies substantial competitive injury, and has provided no specific factual or evidentiary showing to support such allegations. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). In addition, we conclude MSB has failed to establish a *prima facie* case that any of the remaining information is a trade secret. *See id.* § 552.110(a); ORD 402. Therefore, the authority may not withhold any of the remaining information under section 552.110.

We 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 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.


To conclude, the authority must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.110 of the Government Code. The department must release the remaining information, but may only release any copyrighted information 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/>

[orl_ruling_info.shtml](#), 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,


James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/tch

Ref: ID# 491621

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. A. Lee Rigby
Counsel for Gila LLC d/b/a Municipal Services Bureau
Smith, Robertson, Elliott & Douglas, L.L.P.
221 West Sixth Street, Suite 1100
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Richard J. Bastan
Vice President
Xerox State & Local Solutions, Inc.
12410 Milestone Center Drive
Germantown, Maryland 20876
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Gary Hausdorfer
President
Cofiroute USA, L.L.C.
20 Pacifica, Suite 420
Irvine, California 92618
(w/o enclosures)