



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

May 20, 2008

Ms. Carolyn Hanahan
Fort Bend Independent School District Attorney
16431 Lexington Boulevard
Sugar Land, Texas 77479

OR2008-06919

Dear Ms. Hanahan:

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# 310558.

The Fort Bend Independent School District (the "district") received a request for the contracts and amendments, proposals, follow-up documents, score sheets, and recommendation packets for request for proposal ("RFP") #134 pertaining to the district's Pharmacy Benefit Management Services. Although you take no position with respect to the requested information, you indicate that it may contain proprietary information. You state, and provide documentation showing, that you have notified two interested third parties of the request and of their opportunity to submit comments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released to the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain the applicability of exception to disclose under Act in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that you have only submitted a service agreement between the district and United HealthCare Insurance Company, United HealthCare Insurance Company's proposal, and two identical copies of a June 14, 2005 recommendation packet wherein it is stated that "[a] total of eleven Pharmacy Benefit Managers responded [with proposals] to the [district's RFP]." You have not submitted information responsive to the request for all other proposals submitted or all follow up documents received in response to the RFP. To the extent information pertaining to all other proposals submitted and/or all follow up documents received in response to the RFP existed when the district received this request, we assume that information has been released. If not, you must do so at this time. *See* Gov't Code § 552.006, .301, .302; *see* Open Records Decision No. 664 (2000) (noting that if governmental body concludes that no exceptions apply to requested information, it must release information as soon as possible).

An interested third party is allowed ten business days from the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice under section 552.305 of the Government Code 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 decision, this office has received no correspondence from either of the third parties that were notified. Thus, because neither of the third parties have demonstrated that any of the information at issue is proprietary for the purposes of the Act, the district may not withhold any of the submitted information on that basis. *See id.* § 552.110; Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence 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).

Finally, we note that some of the submitted materials are copyrighted. 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, as we have received no arguments against the disclosure of the submitted information, it must be released to the requestor in accordance with applicable 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,



Nancy E. Griffiths
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

NEG/jb

Ref: ID# 310558

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Jeannet Maldonado
Catalyst Rx
800 King Farm Boulevard
Rockville, Maryland 20850
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Dennis Noel
United Healthcare Insurance Company
450 Columbus Boulevard
Hartford, Connecticut 06115-0459
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Christopher v. Goff, Esq.
6199 Frank Avenue, NorthWest
North Canton, Ohio 44720
(w/o enclosures)