



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

February 25, 2013

Mr. Warren Ernst  
Chief of the General Counsel Division  
City of Dallas  
1500 Marilla Street, Room 7DN  
Dallas, Texas 75201

OR2013-03167

Dear Mr. Ernst:

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# 479608.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for information pertaining to the master agreements covering the purchases of public safety radios since January 1, 2002 to the date of the request including (1) all winning bids, proposals, and amendments, including prices; (2) all winning bids and proposals related to the construction of public safety radio networks, including towers and base stations and their maintenance; (3) any sole source contracts and a copy of its justification; (4) the names of losing bidders on each master agreement; and (5) full copies of all bids for each contract, or first and last pages of each bid.<sup>1</sup> You state you will make some information available for inspection by the requestor. You claim a portion of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code. You also claim release of a portion of the requested information may implicate the proprietary interests of Motorola, Inc. ("Motorola").

---

<sup>1</sup>You state the city sought and received clarification of the information requested. See Gov't Code § 552.222 (providing that if request for information is unclear, governmental body may ask requestor to clarify request); see also *City of Dallas v. Abbott*, 304 S.W.3d 380, 387 (Tex. 2010) (holding that when a governmental entity, acting in good faith, requests clarification or narrowing of an unclear or over-broad request for public information, the ten-day period to request an attorney general ruling is measured from the date the request is clarified or narrowed).

Accordingly, you notified Motorola of the request and of its 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); Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permitted governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception to disclosure under the circumstances). We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted information, a portion of which consists of a representative sample.<sup>2</sup>

Initially, we note the submitted information contains resolutions of the city's council. Because laws and ordinances are binding on members of the public, they are matters of public record and may not be withheld from disclosure under the Act. *See* Open Records Decision No. 221 at 1 (1979) ("official records of the public proceedings of a governmental body are among the most open of records"); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 551 at 2-3 (1990) (laws or ordinances are open records). A resolution is analogous to an ordinance. Accordingly, the resolutions, which we have marked, must be released.

Section 552.108(a)(1) excepts from disclosure "[i]nformation held by a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that deals with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime . . . if . . . release of the information would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime[.]" Gov't Code § 552.108(a)(1). A governmental body claiming section 552.108 must reasonably explain how and why the release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement. *See id.* §§ 552.108(a)(1), .301(e)(1)(A); *see also Ex parte Pruitt*, 551 S.W.2d 706 (Tex. 1977). The United States Attorney's Office for the Northern District of Texas has submitted arguments to this office stating the information at issue in Exhibit B pertains to an ongoing criminal investigation. Based on the United States Attorney's Office's representation and our review, we conclude the release of the information at issue in Exhibit B would interfere with the detection, investigation, or prosecution of crime. *See Houston Chronicle Publ'g Co. v. City of Houston*, 531 S.W.2d 177 (Tex. Civ. App.-Houston [14th Dist.] 1975) (court delineates law enforcement interests that are present in active cases), *writ ref'd n.r.e. per curiam*, 536 S.W.2d 559 (Tex. 1976). Thus, section 552.108(a)(1) is applicable to the information at issue in Exhibit B, and the city may withhold it under section 552.108(a)(1).

We note 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

---

<sup>2</sup>We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

this letter, we have not received arguments from Motorola. Thus, Motorola has not demonstrated it has 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 information in Exhibit C on the basis of any proprietary interests Motorola may have in the information.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code states that “[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.”<sup>3</sup> Gov’t Code § 552.136(b). This office has determined that insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See id.* § 552.136(a) (defining “access device”). Therefore, the city must withhold the insurance policy numbers we have marked in Exhibit C pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code.

We note some of the submitted information in Exhibit C 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. 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 may withhold the information at issue in Exhibit B under section 552.108(a)(1). The city must withhold the information we have marked in Exhibit C under section 552.136 of the Government Code. The remaining information must be released, but 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.


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

---

<sup>3</sup>The 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).

responsibilities, please visit our website at [http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index\\_orl.php](http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php), 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 must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Thana Hussaini  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

TH/som

Ref: ID# 479608

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Edward Fuerst  
Motorola, Inc.  
1507 LBJ Freeway, Suite 700  
Farmers Branch, Texas 75234  
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Walter M. Junker  
Assistant United States Attorney  
Northern District of Texas  
1100 Commerce Street, Suite 300  
Dallas, Texas 75242  
(w/o enclosures)