



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 28, 2013

Ms. Michele Freeland  
Legal Assistant  
Office of General Counsel  
Texas Department of Public Safety  
P.O. Box 4087  
Austin, Texas 78773

OR2013-18713

Dear Ms. Freeland:

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# 503707 (DPS PIR#13-3137).

The Texas Department of Public Safety (the "department") received two requests for the evaluation sheets, technical proposals, and price proposals for Solicitation No. 405-LES-12-023213, Biometric Capture System. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the requested information, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of NEC Corporation of America ("NEC"), PPI Secure Solutions ("PPI"), and 3M Cogent, Inc. ("3M"). Accordingly, you state you have notified these third parties of the requests 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 (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 the circumstances). We have received comments from NEC. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note the department did not submit the requested evaluation sheets. To the extent information responsive to this portion of the request existed at the time the department

received the instant request, we assume the department has released it to the requestor. If not, then the department must do so immediately. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.006, .301, .302; Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000).

Next, we note 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 letter, we have not received arguments from PPI or 3M. Thus, PPI and 3M have not demonstrated 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 department may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interests PPI or 3M may have in the information.

NEC raises section 552.101 of the Government Code. This section excepts from disclosure "information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision." Gov't Code § 552.101. We note, however, NEC has not pointed to any law, nor are we aware of any, that would make any of its information confidential for purposes of section 552.101. *See, e.g.,* Open Records Decision Nos. 611 at 1 (1992) (common-law privacy), 600 at 4 (1992) (constitutional privacy), 478 at 2 (1987) (statutory confidentiality). Therefore, none of NEC's information may be withheld under section 552.101 of the Government Code.

NEC generally raises section 552.110 for its information. 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 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.<sup>1</sup> 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 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).

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* ORD 661 at 5.

Upon review, we determine NEC has failed to demonstrate that any portion of its information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor has it demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. Accordingly, the department may not withhold any of NEC’s information on the basis of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code. Furthermore, we find NEC has made only conclusory allegations that the release of any of its information would result in substantial damage to its competitive position. Thus, NEC has not demonstrated that substantial competitive injury would result from the release

---

<sup>1</sup>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).

of any of its information. *See* ORD 661 at 5. Accordingly, none of NEC's information may be withheld under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

We note some 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. As no further exceptions against disclosure are raised, the submitted information must be released; however, 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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl\\_ruling\\_info.shtml](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,



Thana Hussaini  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TH/som

Ref: ID# 503707

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Ashanti S. Jones, CFCM  
Senior Contract Manager  
NEC Corporation of America  
6535 North State Highway 161  
Irving, Texas 75093  
(w/o enclosures)

Dean Warner  
PPI Secure Solutions  
c/o Michele Freeland  
Legal Assistant  
Office of General Counsel  
Texas Department of Public Safety  
P.O. Box 4087  
Austin, Texas 78773  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Keith Gillon  
3M Cogent, Inc.  
639 North Rosemead Boulevard  
Pasadena, California 91107  
(w/o enclosures)