



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

September 14, 2007

Ms. Cathy Cunningham  
Senior Assistant City Attorney  
City of Irving  
825 West Irving Boulevard  
Irving, Texas 75060

OR2007-11998

Dear Ms. Cunningham:

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# 289509.

The City of Irving (the "city") received a request for a copy of a contract that resulted from "Cell Phone Plan" RFQ 2005-2006-18994. Although the city raises no arguments against disclosure of the submitted contract, the city believes this information may involve the proprietary interests of third party Verizon Wireless ("Verizon").<sup>1</sup> Accordingly, you inform us, and provide documentation showing, that pursuant to section 552.305 of the Government Code, the city notified Verizon of the request for information and of its right to submit arguments explaining why the contract 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 that 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.

---

<sup>1</sup>You state that contracts were awarded to Sprint/Nextel Communications, Inc. ("Sprint") and Verizon. You indicate that a copy of the contract awarded to Sprint will be released to the requestor, but believe the contract with Verizon may implicate Verizon's third party proprietary interests.

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, we have not received any arguments from Verizon for withholding the submitted contract. Therefore, we have no basis to conclude that the release of the contract would harm the proprietary interests of this third party. *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, the city must release the contract to the requestor.

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,



M. Alan Akin  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

MAA/mcf

Ref: ID# 289509

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. Edward Stith  
Strategic Partnerships, Inc.  
6034 West Courtyard Drive, Suite 100  
Austin, Texas 78730  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Todd Loccisano  
Director  
Government Contract Management  
Verizon Wireless  
7600 Montpelier Road  
Laurel, Maryland 20723  
(w/o enclosures)