

FILE

6

RECEIVED-DOCKETING DIV

**BEFORE**  
**THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF OHIO** 2011 MAY 13 PM 4:49

In the Matter of the Commission's )  
Investigation into Intrastate Carrier Access )  
Reform Pursuant to Sub. S.B. 162 )

Case No. 10-2387-TP-COI **PUCO**

---


**MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER**

---

Now comes Insight Phone of Ohio, LLC dba Insight ("Insight"), a contributing carrier as defined by the November 3, 2010 Entry in this matter, and seeking to respond to the February 23, 2011 Entry in this matter, and pursuant to Rule 4901-1-24(D) of the Ohio Administrative Code ("O.A.C.") moves for a protective order to keep its response to item (4), Appendix D of the November 3, 2010 Entry ("Appendix D") confidential and not part of the public record. The reasons underlying this motion are detailed in the attached Memorandum in Support. Consistent with the requirements of the above cited Rule, three (3) unredacted copies of the exhibits are submitted under seal.

WHEREFORE, Insight respectfully requests that the Commission grant its motion for a protective order.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Stephen M. Howard (0022421)  
Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP  
52 East Gay Street  
P.O. Box 1008  
Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008  
(614) 464-5401  
[smhoward@vorys.com](mailto:smhoward@vorys.com)

Counsel for Insight Phone of Ohio, LLC dba Insight

This is to certify that the images appearing are an accurate and complete reproduction of a case file document delivered in the regular course of business.  
Technician SW Date Processed **MAY 16 2011**

**MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF  
MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER**

---

Insight requests that its responses to Appendix D be designated as confidential and be protected from public disclosure. The information for which protection is sought covers: (4) the contributing carrier's 2010 total Ohio access lines as of December 31, 2010. Such information if released to the public would harm Insight by providing its competitors proprietary information in what is designed by statute to now be a competitive service.

Rule 4901-1-24(D) of the Ohio Administrative Code provides that the Commission or certain designated employees may issue an order which is necessary to protect the confidentiality of information contained in documents filed with the Commission's Docketing Division to the extent that state or federal law prohibits the release of the information and where non-disclosure of the information is not inconsistent with the purposes of Title 49 of the Revised Code. State law recognizes the need to protect certain types of information which are the subject of this motion. The non-disclosure of the information will not impair the purposes of Title 49. The Commission and its Staff have full access to the information in order to fulfill its statutory obligations. No purpose of Title 49 would be served by the public disclosure of the information.

The need to protect the designated information from public disclosure is clear, and there is compelling legal authority supporting the requested protective order. While the Commission has often expressed its preference for open proceedings, the Commission also long ago recognized its statutory obligations with regard to trade secrets:

The Commission is of the opinion that the "public records" statute must also be read in pari materia with Section 1333.31, Revised Code ("trade secrets" statute). The latter statute must be

interpreted as evincing the recognition, on the part of the General Assembly, of the value of trade secret information.

In re: General Telephone Co., Case No. 81-383-TP-AIR (Entry, February 17, 1982.) Likewise, the Commission has facilitated the protection of trade secrets in its rules (O.A.C. § 4901-1-24(A)(7)).

The definition of a "trade secret" is set forth in the Uniform Trade Secrets Act:

"Trade secret" means information, including the whole or any portion or phase of any scientific or technical information, design, process, procedure, formula, pattern, compilation, program, device, method, technique, or improvement, or any business information or plans, financial information or listing of names, addresses, or telephone numbers, that satisfies both of the following:

- (1) It derives independent economic value, actual or potential, from not being generally known to, and not being readily ascertainable by proper means by, other persons who can obtain economic value from its disclosure or use.
- (2) It is the subject of efforts that are reasonable under the circumstances to maintain its secrecy.

R.C. § 1333.61(D). This definition clearly reflects the state policy favoring the protection of trade secrets such as the financial information which is the subject of this motion.

In State ex rel The Plain Dealer the Ohio Dept. of Ins. (1997), 80 Ohio St. 3d 513, the Ohio Supreme Court adopted a six factor test to analyze whether information is a trade secret under the statute:

- (1) The extent to which the information is known outside the business, (2) the extent to which it is known to those inside the business, i.e., by the employees, (3) the precautions taken by the holder of the trade secret to guard the secrecy of the information, (4) the savings effected and the value to the holder in having the information as against competitors, (5) the amount of effort or money expended in obtaining and developing the information, and (6) the amount of time and expense it would take for others to acquire and duplicate the information.

Id. at 524-525 (quoting Pyromatics, Inc. v. Petruziello, 7 Ohio App. 3d 131, 134-135 (Cuyahoga County 1983)).


Applying these factors to the responses to Appendix D Insight seeks to protect, it is clear that a protective order should be granted.

The response to item (4), Appendix D includes the number of Ohio access lines as of December 31, 2010. Such sensitive information constitutes trade secret information and is generally not disclosed. Its public disclosure could give competitors an advantage that would hinder Insight's ability to compete. In addition, public disclosure of this trade secret information is not likely to assist the Commission.

Courts of other jurisdictions have held that not only does a public utilities commission have the authority to protect the trade secrets of the companies subject to its jurisdiction, the trade secrets statute creates a duty to protect them. New York Tel. Co. v. Pub. Serv. Comm. N.Y., 56 N.Y. 2d 213 (1982). Indeed, for the Commission to do otherwise would be to negate the protections the Ohio General Assembly has granted to all businesses, including public utilities. This Commission has previously carried out its obligations in this regard in numerous other proceedings. See, e.g., Elyria Tel. Co., Case No. 89-965-TP-AEC (Finding and Order, September 21, 1989); Ohio Bell Tel. Co., Case No. 89-718-TP-ATA (Finding and Order, May 31, 1989); Columbia Gas of Ohio, Inc., Case No. 90-17-GA-GCR (Entry, August 17, 1990).

WHEREFORE, for the above reasons Insight requests the Commission grant its motion for a protective order and to maintain the response to item (4), Appendix D under seal.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Stephen M. Howard (0022421)  
Vorys, Sater, Seymour and Pease LLP  
52 East Gay Street  
P.O. Box 1008  
Columbus, Ohio 43216-1008  
(614) 464-5401  
[smhoward@vorys.com](mailto:smhoward@vorys.com)

Counsel for Insight Phone of Ohio, LLC dba Insight

LIST OF INFORMATION  
FOR WHICH PROTECTION IS SOUGHT

INFORMATION

Response to item 4, Appendix D which includes the contributing carrier's total Ohio access lines as of December 31, 2010.

REASONS JUSTIFYING PROTECTION

The response to item 4, Appendix D contains trade secret information. Disclosure would give an undue advantage to competitors and would hinder the moving contributing carrier's ability to compete.