



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

April 22, 2013

Mr. Frank J. Garza
Davidson, Troilo, Ream & Garza, P.C.
7550 West Interstate 10, Suite 800
San Antonio, Texas 78229-5815

OR2013-06544

Dear Mr. Garza:

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# 487170.

The City of Kyle (the "city"), which you represent, received a request for information, including proposals, related to a specified RFP for a CAD/RMS System. You state the city has released some of the requested information. You do not take a position as to whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure under the Act. However, you state, and provide documentation showing, you notified New World Systems of the city's receipt of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments to this office as to why the requested information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 at 3 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in Act in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the city's procedural obligations under section 552.301 of the Government Code, which prescribes the procedures that 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. Gov't Code § 552.301(b). You inform us the city received the request for information on February 20, 2013. Thus, the city's ten-business-day deadline to request a ruling was March 6, 2013. However, the envelope containing your request for a ruling from this office is metermarked March 7, 2013. *See id.* § 552.308 (describing rules for calculating submission dates of documents sent via first class United States mail). Therefore, the city failed to comply with the procedural requirements mandated by section 552.301(b).

Pursuant to section 552.302 of the Government Code, a governmental body's failure to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 results in the legal presumption


that the requested information is public and must be released unless the governmental body demonstrates a compelling reason to withhold the information from disclosure. *See 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). A compelling reason exists when third-party interests are at stake or when information is confidential under other law. Open Records Decision No. 150 (1977). The interests of New World Systems, an interested third party, are at stake. Therefore, we will consider whether the submitted information must be withheld from release 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 requested information relating to it should be withheld from disclosure. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B). As of the date of this letter, New World Systems has not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why the submitted information should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding any portion of the submitted information constitutes proprietary information of that third party, and the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on that basis. *See* 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 must release the submitted information to the requestor.

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, 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,


James L. Coggeshall
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

JLC/tch

Ref: ID# 487170

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Terry Roy
Regional Territory Manager
New World Systems
888 West Big Beaver Road, Suite 600
Troy, Michigan 48084
(w/o enclosures)