



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 11, 2008

Mr. Martin Zelinsky
Assistant General Counsel
Department of Information Resources
P.O. Box 13564
Austin, Texas 78711-3564

OR2008-03293

Dear Mr. Zelinsky:

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# 304671.

The Department of Information Resources (the "department") received a request for the responses to RFI# DIR-TXO-RFI-010. You state you have provided the requestor with some of the requested information. You take no position with respect to the submitted information, but claim that the information may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act.¹ Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, that you notified Strategic Partnerships, CGI, Deloitte, Lockheed Martin, ProTech Solutions, SysTest Labs, and Vignette of the department's receipt of the request for information and of each company's right to submit arguments to this office as to why the information at issue should not be released to the requestor. *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 reviewed the submitted 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 information relating to that party should be withheld from public disclosure. *See* Gov't Code

¹ Although you raise sections 552.101, 552.104, and 552.110 of the Government Code, you have not submitted arguments explaining how these exceptions apply to the submitted information. Therefore, we presume that you have withdrawn these exceptions. *See* Gov't Code §§ 552.301, .302.

§ 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, we have not received comments from any of the notified companies explaining why the requested information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that any of the companies have protected proprietary interests in any of the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110; 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 (1990).

You state that some of the submitted information appears 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). Accordingly, the submitted information must be released to the requestor in accordance 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 file suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such a challenge, 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 challenge 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,



Leah B. Wingerson
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LBW/ma

Ref: ID# 304671

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Edward Stith
Strategic Partnerships
6034 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 100
Austin, Texas 78730
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Cindy Diaz
CGI
100 Congress, Suite 1550
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Howard D. Blagg
Deloitte
400 West 15th, Suite 1700
Austin, Texas 78701
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. David M. Hansell
Lockheed Martin
4150 Friedrich Lane, Suite J
Austin, Texas 78744
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Chris Fyffe
ProTech Solutions
4100 Alpha Road, Suite 900
Dallas, Texas 75244
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Tim Walker
SysTest Labs
216 16th Street, Suite 700
Denver, Colorado 80202
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dax French
Vignette
c/o Mr. Martin Zelinsky
Assistant General Counsel
Department of Information Resources
P.O. Box 13564
Austin, Texas 78711-3564
(w/o enclosures)