



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

September 13, 2005

Mr. Rashaad V. Gambrell
Assistant City Attorney
City of Houston
P.O. Box 1562
Houston, Texas 77251-1562

OR2005-08339

Dear Mr. Gambrell:

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# 232079.

The City of Houston (the "city") received two requests for information pertaining to RFP# TC-4-5820-10-20303 for a Video Arraignment and Teleconference System. Although you assert that the submitted information may be excepted from disclosure under section 552.101, 552.104, 552.110, 552.113, 552.131 or 552.133 of the Government Code, you make no arguments regarding these exceptions. Instead, pursuant to section 552.305, you have notified the following third parties: Court Vision Communication, Inc ("Court Vision"); MCPc, Inc. ("MCPc"); Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P. ("SBC"); Phonoscope, Ltd. ("Phonoscope"); SDRG Controls, Inc. ("SDRG"); and VUGATE, Inc. ("VUGATE") of the request and of their 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.

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, none of the interested third parties have submitted to this office any reasons explaining why their information should not be released. We thus have no basis for concluding that any portion of the submitted information constitutes proprietary information, and none of it may be withheld on that basis. *See, e.g.,*

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). Accordingly, the city may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest.

We note that some of the remaining submitted information is subject to section 552.136 of the Government Code, which states that “[n]otwithstanding any other provision of this chapter, 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. Accordingly, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers that we have marked under section 552.136.

Lastly, we note that portions of the remaining submitted information include notice of copyright protection. 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 city must withhold the policy numbers we have marked under section 552.136. The city must release all remaining information to the requestor in accordance with applicable 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); *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,



L. Joseph James
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

LJJ/seg

Ref: ID# 232079

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Jeff Nadler
CourtSmart
1428 West Enfield Way
Chandler, Arizona 85248
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Rhonda Drake
President
Phonoscope, Ltd.
6105 Westline Drive
Houston, Texas 77036
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Don W. Mettert
President/CEO
Court Vision Communication, Inc.
3321 Grande Vista Drive
Thousand Oaks, California 91320
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Fred Cain
Sales Manager
MCPc, Inc.
2211 Norfolk Avenue, Suite 806
Houston, Texas 77098
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. George Doland
Technical Director
SDRG Controls, Inc.
8234 Braniff
Houston, Texas 77061
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Joe Ewen
Regional Sales Manager
Southwestern Bell Telephone, L.P.
One Bell Plaza, 12th Floor
Dallas, Texas 75202
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Michael Bulriss
President
VUGATE, Inc.
4830 Research Drive
San Antonio, Texas 78240-5004
(w/o enclosures)