



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 10, 2007

Mr. Miles K. Risley  
Senior Assistant City Attorney  
City of Victoria  
P.O. Box 1758  
Victoria, Texas 77902-1758

OR2007-13197

Dear Mr. Risley:

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# 292407.

The City of Victoria (the "city") received a request for proposals, excluding the requestor's, received by the city in response to an "RFP for Handheld Traffic Ticket Writer." You state that some responsive information has been released to the requestor. You claim that the remaining requested information may be excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101 and 552.110 of the Government Code. You make no arguments and take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under either of those exceptions. You have notified the third parties whose proprietary interests may be implicated of the request for information pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> 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) (determining that statutory predecessor to Gov't Code § 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Chapter 552 of Government Code in certain circumstances). The city has submitted the information at issue to this office.

---

<sup>1</sup>The interested third parties that received notice pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code are the following: Brazos Technology Corp., Duncan Solutions, Inc., and EZTag Corp.

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 decision, no third party has submitted to this office any reasons explaining why its information should not be released. Therefore, no third party has provided us with a basis to conclude that it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See, e.g., id.* § 552.110(b) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual or evidentiary material, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that it actually faces competition and that substantial competitive injury would likely result from disclosure); Open Records Decision Nos. 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3 (1990).

We note that portions of the submitted information appear to 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. Attorney General Opinion JM-672 (1987). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.* 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. *See* Open Records Decision No. 550 (1990). Thus, the submitted information must be released to the requestor; however, in releasing information that is protected by copyright, the city must comply with copyright law.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records 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 records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, upon receiving this ruling, the governmental body will either release the public records promptly pursuant to section 552.221(a) of the

Government Code or file a lawsuit challenging this ruling pursuant to section 552.324 of the Government Code. If the governmental body fails to do one of these things, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Office of the Attorney General at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



Cindy Nettles  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CN/mcf

Ref: ID# 292407

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Pamela MacDougall  
Advanced Public Safety  
500 Fairway Drive, Suite 204  
Deerfield Beach, Florida 33441  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bob Chambers  
EZTag Corporation  
VP Development  
334 Cornelia Street, #549  
Plattsburgh, New York 12901  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Mike Nickolaus  
Duncan Solutions, Inc.  
633 West Wisconsin Avenue  
Suite 1600  
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53203  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael McAleer  
Senior Partner  
Brazos Technology Corporation  
707 South Texas Avenue, Suite 103D  
College Station, Texas 77840  
(w/o enclosures)