



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

July 12, 2005

Ms. Jennifer Hall
Escamilla & Poneck, Inc.
P.O. Box 200
San Antonio, Texas 78291-0200

OR2005-06140

Dear Ms. Hall:

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# 227916.

The San Antonio Independent School District (the "district"), which you represent, received three requests for information related to RFP 04-209(RC) "District-wide Copier Solution Phase II." You state that you have provided the requestors with some of the requested information. Although you take no position with respect to the remaining requested information, you claim that it may contain proprietary information subject to exception under the Act. Pursuant to section 552.305(d) of the Government Code, you have notified interested third party Ikon Office Solutions ("Ikon") of the requests and of its opportunity to submit comments to this office. *See Gov't Code § 552.305* (permitting interested third party to submit to attorney general reasons why requested information should not be released); 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 applicability of exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we must address the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code. Pursuant to section 552.301(b), a governmental body must ask for a decision from us and state the exceptions that apply not later than the tenth business day after the date of receiving the written request. *See Gov't Code § 552.301(b)*. You state, and the submitted information reflects, that the district received the initial request for information from the first

requestor on April 12, 2005. You further state that the district asked the first requestor to clarify his request on April 15, 2005. *See* Gov't Code § 552.222; *see also* Open Records Decision No. 31 (1974) (stating that when governmental bodies are presented with broad requests for information rather than for specific records, governmental body may advise requestor of types of information available so that request may be properly narrowed). Thus, the ten business day time period to request a decision from us under section 552.301(b) was tolled on the date that the district sought clarification of the request from the first requestor. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(b); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 663 at 5 (1999) (providing that ten-day period is tolled during the clarification process). You have provided documentation showing that the district received the first requestor's clarification on April 18, 2005. Accordingly, we conclude that the ten business day time period for requesting a decision from our office regarding the first request resumed on April 19, 2005. The district did not request a decision from this office or submit the information at issue until May 6, 2005. *See* Gov't Code § 552.301(e) (governmental body must submit copies or representative sample of specific information requested within fifteen business days of its receipt of request). Consequently, we conclude that the district failed to comply with the procedural requirements of section 552.301 of the Government Code in requesting this decision from us.

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* Gov't Code § 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 speaking, a compelling reason for non-disclosure 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 information at issue must be withheld to protect third party interests.

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, Ikon has not submitted to this office any reasons explaining why the submitted information should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information constitutes proprietary information protected under section 552.110, and none of it may be withheld on that basis. *See* Gov't Code § 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).

We note, however, that a portion of the submitted information is 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. 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).

In summary, the district must release the submitted information in its entirety. The information that is protected by copyright may only be released in accordance with federal 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 appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, 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 appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Tex. 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 Texas Building and Procurement Commission 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. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. 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,



Lauren E. Kleine
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LEK/jev

Ref: ID# 227916

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Eric McCabe
Konica-Minolta
325 East Ramsey
San Antonio, Texas 78216
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Rodney Bowles
OCS Office Communications Systems
10231 Kotzebue
San Antonio, Texas 78217
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Thomas Thomas
Xerox
100 Northeast Loop 410, Suite 900
San Antonio, Texas 78216
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Bob Raymond
Ikon Office Solutions, Inc.
121 Interpark Boulevard, Suite 104
San Antonio, Texas 78216
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Sylvia Reyna
San Antonio Independent School District
141 Lavaca Street
San Antonio, Texas 78210
(w/o enclosures)