



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

July 28, 2006

Mr. W. Montgomery Meitler  
Senior Attorney  
Texas Department of Family and Protective Services  
Mail Code E- 611, P.O. Box 149030  
Austin, Texas 78714-9030

OR2006-08260

Dear Mr. Meitler:

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# 255738.

The Texas Department of Family and Protective Services (the "department") received a request for proposals submitted by EDS, IBM, Unisys, and Northrop Grumman Information Technology ("NGIT") in response to RFO #2006-0001. You state that IBM did not submit a proposal in response to RFO #2006-0001.<sup>1</sup> You state that NGIT's proposal is the subject of a previous request for information, in response to which this office issued Open Records Letter No. 2006-07268 (2006). In that letter, this office held that NGIT's proposal must be released. We assume the department has released NGIT's proposal in accordance with Open Records Letter No. 2006-07268. You claim that the release of the submitted information may implicate the proprietary interests of EDS and Unisys. Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, that you notified EDS and Unisys of the request and of their right to submit arguments to this office as to why the submitted information should not be released. See Gov't Code § 552.305(d) (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 that statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability

---

<sup>1</sup>We note that the Act does not require a governmental body to disclose information that did not exist at the time the request was received. *Econ. Opportunities Dev. Corp. v. Bustamante*, 562 S.W.2d 266 (Tex.Civ.App.—San Antonio 1978, writ dismissed); Open Records Decision No. 452 at 3 (1986).

of exception to disclosure in certain circumstances). We have reviewed the submitted information.

Section 552.305 of the Government Code allows an interested third party ten business days from 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 id.* § 552.305(d)(2)(B). However, as of the date of this letter, we have not received arguments from EDS or Unisys for withholding any of the submitted information. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that the release of any of the submitted information would harm the proprietary interests of these companies. *See id.* § 551.110(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (stating that business enterprise that claims exception for commercial or financial information under section 552.110(b) must show by specific factual evidence 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). Accordingly, we conclude that the department may not withhold any portion of the submitted information on the basis of any proprietary interest that EDS or Unisys may have in it.

We note, however, that some of the submitted information 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. 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). Therefore, the submitted information must be released in accordance with 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,



James A. Person III  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

JAP/dh

Ref: ID# 255738

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Ms. Judy Breese  
3504 Lost Oasis Hollow  
Austin, Texas 78739  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. James Arndell  
Contracts Manager  
Northrup Grumman  
Information Technology  
100 Sun Avenue, Suite 300  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87109  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Karen Wilson  
Northrup Grumman  
Information Technology  
7745 Chevy Chase Drive  
Building V, Suite 100  
Austin, Texas 75752  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Kevin J. Durkin  
Vice President  
U.S. Government Solutions  
EDS  
5400 Legacy Drive  
Plano, Texas 75024  
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Kate Connolly  
Executive Director  
Texas Public Sector  
Unisys  
1704 Allium Drive  
Austin, Texas 78733  
(w/o enclosures)