



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

November 6, 2012

Mr. Warren M.S. Ernst  
Chief of the General Counsel Division  
City of Dallas  
1500 Marilla Street, Room 7DN  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2012-17818

Dear Mr. Ernst:

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# 470318.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for a specified Master Agreement between the city and Motorola Solutions, Inc. ("Motorola"). Although you take no position as to whether the submitted information is excepted under the Act, you state its release may implicate the proprietary interests of Motorola. Accordingly, you state, and provide documentation showing, you have notified Motorola of the request and its right to submit arguments to this office. *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 received and considered comments submitted by the United States Department of Justice (the "DOJ") and the requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.304 (interested party may submit comments stating why information should or should not be released). The DOJ informs us it does not object to the release of the master agreement at issue. We have reviewed the submitted information and the submitted arguments.

Initially, we must address the city's obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures a governmental body must follow in asking this office to decide whether requested information is excepted from public disclosure. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from this office and state the exceptions that apply within ten business days of receiving the written request. *See id.* § 552.301(b). Further, pursuant to section 552.301(e), a governmental body must submit to

this office within fifteen business days of receiving an open records request (1) written comments stating the reasons why the stated exceptions apply that would allow the information to be withheld, (2) a copy of the written request for information, (3) a signed statement or sufficient evidence showing the date the governmental body received the written request, and (4) a copy of the specific information requested or representative samples, labeled to indicate which exceptions apply to which parts of the documents. *See id.* § 552.301(e). You state the city received the request for information on May 30, 2012. Accordingly, you were required to provide the information required by subsection 552.301(b) by June 13, 2012. Moreover, you were required to provide the information required by section 552.301(e) by June 20, 2012. However, the envelope in which the city provided the information required by subsections 552.301(b) and 552.301(e) was postmarked August 29, 2012. *See id.* § 552.308(a)(1) (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail, common or contract carrier, or interagency mail). Accordingly, we conclude the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301 of the Government Code.

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code 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. *Id.* § 552.302; *Simmons v. Kuzmich*, 166 S.W.3d 342, 350 (Tex. App.—Fort Worth 2005, no pet.); *Hancock v. State Bd. of Ins.*, 797 S.W.2d 379, 381 (Tex. App.—Austin 1990, no writ); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 630 (1994). 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 any of the responsive information may be excepted under the Act.

Next, we note an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice 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 letter, we have not received arguments from Motorola. Thus, Motorola has failed to demonstrate it has a protected proprietary interest in any of the submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); 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. Accordingly, the city may not withhold the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest Motorola may have in the information.

We note the submitted information contains insurance policy numbers. Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code states “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or

maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential.”<sup>1</sup> Gov’t Code § 552.136(b). This office has determined an insurance policy number is an access device for purposes of section 552.136. Therefore, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We also note some of the information at issue may 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. Open Records Decision No. 180 at 3 (1977). A governmental body must allow inspection of copyrighted materials unless an exception applies to the information. *Id.*; see Open Records Decision No. 109 (1975). 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.

In summary, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The city must release the remaining information, but any information protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with copyright law.

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

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php), or call the Office of the Attorney General’s Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Cynthia G. Tynan  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

CGT/akg

---

<sup>1</sup>The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. See Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

Ref: ID# 470318

Enc. Submitted documents

---

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Edward Fuerst  
Motorola, Inc.  
1507 LBJ Freeway, Suite 700  
Farmers Branch, Texas 75234  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Walt M. Junker  
Assistant United States Attorney  
United States Attorney's Office  
1100 Commerce Street, Suite 300  
Dallas, Texas 75242  
(w/o enclosures)