



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

February 6, 2014

Ms. Julie Y. Fort
Counsel for the City of Denison
Messer Rockefeller Fort
6351 Preston Road, Suite 350
Frisco, Texas 75034

OR2014-02337

Dear Ms. Fort:

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# 513255.

The City of Denison (the "city"), which you represent, received two requests from different requestors for information pertaining to the request for proposal related to banking depository services. Although you take no position with respect to the public availability of the requested information, you state the proprietary interests of certain third parties might be implicated. Accordingly, you notified Independent Bank ("Independent"), JPMorgan Chase Bank ("Chase"), and Landmark Bank ("Landmark") of the requests and of their right to submit arguments to this office explaining why their information should not be released. *See* Gov't Code § 552.305 (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (determining statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception 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 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 any of the third parties. Thus, Independent, Chase, and Landmark have failed to demonstrate that they have 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 interests Independent, Chase, or Landmark may have in the information.

We note the submitted information contains account numbers subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code.¹ Section 552.136(b) provides, “[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.” Gov't Code § 552.136(b); *see id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code.

In addition, 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. 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 information we have marked under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released; however, 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.

¹The 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).

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.texasattorneygeneral.gov/open/orl_ruling_info.shtml, 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 may be directed to the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Michelle R. Garza", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Michelle R. Garza
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

MRG/som

Ref: ID# 513255

Enc. Submitted documents

c: 2 Requestors
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Carrie Hart
Independent Bank
c/o Julie Y. Fort
Counsel for the City of Denison
Messer Rockefeller Fort
6351 Preston Road, Suite 350
Frisco, Texas 75034
(w/o enclosures)