



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS

GREG ABBOTT

October 28, 2008

Ms. Lisa Ayers
Paralegal, Legal Affairs
Parkland Health & Hospital System
5201 Harry Hines Boulevard
Dallas, Texas 75235

OR2008-14657

Dear Ms. Ayers:

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# 325946.

The Dallas County Hospital District (the "district") received a request for the contract with ACS Consultant Company, Inc. ("ACS") for information technology services, and the price quotes submitted by other bidders for this request for proposals. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the requested information, you state its release may implicate the proprietary interests of third parties. Accordingly, you have notified ACS, EDS Corporation, BPO Management Services, Inc., and InfoCrossing-WIPRO Company of the request and of the companies' right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted contract and pricing information should not be released. *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 must address the district's procedural obligations under the Act. Section 552.301 describes the procedural obligations placed on a governmental body that receives a written request for information it wishes to withhold. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), the governmental body must ask for the attorney general's decision and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days after receiving the request. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(a), (b). You state the district received the request for information on August 6, 2008. However, you did not request a ruling from this office until August 21, 2008. Consequently, we find the district failed to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 in requesting this decision from our office.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption the requested information is public and must be released unless a compelling reason exists to withhold the information from disclosure. *See id.* § 552.302; *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381-82 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ) (governmental body must make compelling demonstration to overcome presumption of openness pursuant to statutory predecessor to section 552.302); Open Records Decision No. 319 (1982). Generally, a compelling reason to withhold information exists where some other source of law makes the information confidential or where third party interests are at stake. Open Records Decision No. 150 at 2 (1977). Because third party interests can provide a compelling reason to withhold information, we will consider whether or not any of the submitted information may be withheld under the Act.

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 letter, we have not received comments from any of the notified third parties explaining why the submitted information should not be released. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude any of the companies have protected proprietary interests in 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). Consequently, the submitted contract and pricing information must be released.

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). If the governmental body does not file suit over 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# 325946

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Shaun West
Fletcher/CSI
P.O. Box 1061
Williston, Vermont 05495
(w/o enclosures)

Corporate Legal Counsel
ACS Consultant Company, Inc.
5225 Auto Club Drive
Dearborn, Michigan 48125
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Walling
Client Sales Executive
EDS Corporation
5400 Legacy Drive
Mailstop H1-2C-73
Plano, Texas 75024
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. John M. Lalli
Senior Vice President, ITO
BPO Management Services, Inc.
1290 North Hancock Street, Suite 202
Anaheim, California 92807
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Jeff Washburn
Vice President, Sales
InfoCrossing, A WIPRO Company
2005 East Technology Circle
Tempe, Arizona 85284
(w/o enclosures)